A

AN

APPEAL AND ADDRESS

TO THE

YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS,

HELD IN

LONDON, A. D. 1814.

AN

APPEAL AND ADDRESS

TO THE

YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS,

HELD IN

LONDON, A.D. 1814.

BY

THOMAS FOSTER,

ON HIS

EXCOMMUNICATION,

FOR ASSERTING THE

UNITY AND SUPREMACY

OF

GOD THE FATHER.

"For this cause *was I born*, and for this cause *I came into the world*, that I might BEAR WITNESS TO THE TRUTH.—If I bear witness OF MYSELF, my witness is not true. There is ANOTHER—THE FATHER, who hath sent me—that beareth witness of me—of whom ye say THAT HE IS YOUR GOD." *Jesus Christ.*

"For there is ONE GOD, and one Mediator between God and men, THE MAN CHRIST JESUS.—To us there is BUT ONE GOD, THE FATHER of whom are all things." *Paul.*

"The GOD of our Fathers raised up *Jesus*, whom ye killed, having hanged him on a Cross: him HATH GOD EXALTED to his right hand, to be *a Leader* and *a Saviour*, to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." *Peter* and the other *Apostles.*

LONDON:

Printed by Stower & Smallfield, Hackney;

AND SOLD BY R. HUNTER, (SUCCESSOR TO J. JOHNSON), ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD.

1815.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page.
Notice of Appeal, March 29th, 1813 - - - - - - - -	2
Letter to the Meeting for Sufferings, Nov. 1st, 1813 - - -	3
Renewed Notice of Appeal, Dec. 26th, 1813 - - - - - -	15
Letter to Sparks Moline and Josiah Messer, Jan. 23d, 1814 -	17
Letter to the Meeting for Sufferings, Feb. 1st, 1814 - - -	18
Letter to the Quarterly Meeting, March 26th, 1814 - - -	23
Discussion thereon - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	24
Letter to the Meeting for Sufferings, May 4th, 1814 - - -	25
Yearly Meeting's rules for conducting Appeals, made in 1813	28
Letter from Luke Howard on behalf of the Respondents on my Appeal, 5th month 13th, 1814 - - - - - - - - - -	30
Letter in reply, May 14th, 1814 - - - - - - - - - -	ib.
Yearly Meeting, 1st and 2d Sittings, 5th month 18th, 1814 -	32
Committee of Appeals chosen - - - - - - - - - - - -	33
——————— 1st Sitting, 5th month 19th - - -	34
Appeal read in the Committee - - - - - - - - - - - -	35
Discussion on the last Article of the Appeal - - - - - - -	47
Committee of Appeals 2d and 3d Sittings, 5th month 20th -	49
Yearly Meeting, 5th month 23d - - - - - - - - - - -	51
Report of Committee - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	53
Grounds of its decision not allowed to be explained - - -	54
Appeal read in the Yearly Meeting, 5th month 24th - - -	55
Address to the Yearly Meeting - - - - - - - - -	55—74
Address to do.; afternoon Sitting - - - - - - - -	74—108
Commencement of Respondents reply - - - - - - - - -	109
Appendix - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	113—125

PREFACE.

IT was my intention to wave the right of appeal to the Yearly Meeting, till the unexpected circumstances stated in the ensuing pages, 3—22, altered my determination. The King and Parliament are not above listening to the complaints of obscure individuals, and such condescension is expected from them under the British Constitution; but a standing Committee of the Yearly Meeting, which had inadvertently, as I am willing to believe, contributed to do me an injury, pertinaciously refused to hear my complaint, even in a respectful letter. Thus situated, and still entitled to exercise the rights of an Appellant, I thought myself called upon to claim them, in order openly to vindicate my character in the face of those who had aspersed it, and to shew the Yearly Meeting how I had been treated by the Society in a collective capacity, both before and *after* my disownment. The latter I wished first to speak to, that I might if possible remove the prejudices excited in my judges, before I entered upon the former.

But silence was peremptorily imposed upon me, as to any thing the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders, or the Meeting for Sufferings had done.

The rules, however, respecting Appeals, so positively enjoin a fair and full hearing of both parties, that every other objection which was afterwards made to my exercising that right was overruled, and principally by the firm and impartial conduct of John Wilkinson, then Clerk of the Yearly Meeting, under which name the duties of a Chairman are exercised.

When ecclesiastics of any profession, acting as a collective body, assume to themselves the power of judging their Christian brethren on matters of faith and worship, the history of almost every church shews, that there is scarcely any injustice within their power which they hesitate to commit; though perhaps as individuals, of irreproachable character. The fact is, that when so associated, they place themselves, however unconscious of it, under the baneful dominion of priestcraft, which is so infectious, that as a celebrated writer once said of it, "*one drop is enough to contaminate the Ocean.*"

This exercise of a coercive authority over conscience, in the administration of the discipline originally established in the Society of

Friends, was early apprehended. William Penn thus endeavours to guard against it. "Church government," says he, "must no more be denied, because the Church of Rome pleads for it, than any other truth that she asserts. There are principles held by Jews and Turks in common with Christians, must Christians therefore renounce these *common truths*, or be branded with Judaism or Turcism? Nor is the abuse of a *principle* or *practice* by any Society a reason, why another communion should be abused for retaining or using it." He adds, speaking in the name and on behalf of the Society, "The *power* WE claim and use, differs both in its *nature* and *object*, from the *power* used by the Roman and other churches too: in *nature*, for our's is not *coercive* and *penal* either by themselves or their proxy, the civil magistrate, who is a member of their church. In *object* they differ, because *their authority regards matters* of FAITH *and* WORSHIP; but that *we use*, ONLY ORDER and THE GOVERNMENT OF SOCIETY. And here I must beseech those into whose hands this may come, to stop a while and ponder with the spirit of meekness and wisdom *this distinction*." In the next page Penn adds, "WE never assumed to ourselves a *faith* or *worship-making*

power, nor did any one—ever charge it upon us.—Our case is plain order, NOT ARTICLES OF FAITH; and the discipline of government, NOT OF WORSHIP."*

Had either of the meetings which decided on my case recognized these fundamental principles upon which the discipline was originally established, would they not in effect have said to my accusers. Ye may be right in point of faith, and the person you accuse may be in error, but neither you, nor are we duly authorized to judge of the soundness of his faith towards God? This is not within the province of our dicipline, which regards *only* order and the government of Society—"*not articles of faith nor matters of worship.*" He professes to believe in Jesus as the Messiah, the anointed of the Father, and in the divinity

* See the Preface to Barclay's Works, Edit. of 1718, pp. 21—23, first published in 1691. Penn's "Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers," was published in 1694. In this work, treating of "The church power they *own* and *exercise*, and that which they *reject* and *condemn*;" he says, "They distinguish between imposing any practice that immediately regards FAITH or WORSHIP, *(which is never to be done or suffered*, or *submitted unto)* and requiring Christian compliance with those methods that *only* respect church business in its more *civil* part and concern; and that regard the discreet and orderly maintenance of the character of the Society as a sober and religious community." Works, vol. i. p. 878.

of his mission—and the obligation of obeying his precepts, and receiving his doctrines as of divine authority.

Why then should ye judge your brother? What rule of the Society do you charge him with having broken?* Would ye have us countenance your injudicious accusation, and thereby proclaim that the rights of conscience for which our ancestors suffered so much, are no longer respected or even tolerated amongst us? Would ye have us unwisely commit the reputation of the Society, as being accountable for the private sentiments of all those whom it retains in membership? Are ye not aware that this would be to cancel "*the bond of peace*" by which our ancestors were united; and that it is highly probable, not to say certain, that many among us hold sentiments very similar to those you denounce?

Would ye by a rigorous inquisition search out these, and either compel them to recant or disguise their opinions; or would you drive them from our communion? Or, would ye

* In my Narrative there are copies of all the minutes relative to my case, up to the time of its publication. I have not repeated them, as their import will sufficiently appear in this work. None of these, I may however observe, accuse me of a breach of any rule of the Society, or of disbelieving any scriptural doctrine.

censure and disown some of these, and *let others go free*, and yet pretend that "the rules of our discipline are impartially put in practice?" Depart with this admonition from the judgment-seat, examine your own hearts, and endeavour to learn "*what manner of spirit ye are of*."

Such I presume would have been in substance the reception of my accusers at the threshold, had the operation of the discipline been confined within those limits, and administered upon those principles on which it was professedly founded. How their accusation was received and acted upon, the following pages will evince. The discipline has indeed, of late years, in many instances been conducted upon widely different principles. Opposite maxims have prevailed among the rulers of the Society, and if they are persisted in, and *tamely submitted to* by the bulk of its members, the consequences are not difficult to foresee.

The question is of no less import to them generally, than whether "the Apostolical order of the church of Christ" is still "the practice and ornament of their Christian Society?" Or, whether the prevalence of a Pharisaic spirit and the love of reputed orthodoxy or the praise of men, have alarmingly

weakened their love of the truth as it is in Jesus, and their estimation of doctrines in proportion to their real importance, and the clearness with which they are laid down in Scripture?

Those readers who may object to this work as an *ex parte* statement, should be informed that I wished it to contain a fair view of the Respondents' reply before the Yearly Meeting, which was delivered the day after my address, and occupied about three hours and a half. During this time I took notes of what struck me as most material, and especially of the references to the numerous quotations of the Respondents, either for the purpose of criminating me, or of exhibiting their own view of the doctrines of the Society.

From these I prepared a summary of their reply, and almost as soon as this work was in the press offered to submit the *MS.* to them, that any errors in it of which they could have reason to complain might be corrected. The Respondents declined this offer, and did not even acknowledge the receipt of the small part of which I sent them a copy. See pp. 109—111.

I have therefore given no account of their reply at large the day following, of my rejoinder the same evening, nor of the discus-

sion the next day in the absence of the parties. I wish, however, to afford the Respondents a fair occasion for publishing their reply, by dropping the curtain at the close of that sitting which heard my address. If they should incline to annex to it any account of my rejoinder, they shall be welcome to the use of my *MS.* with full liberty to add to it, in the form of notes, or otherwise such observations as they may think proper.

Should none of the Respondents be inclined to publish any account of their reply, I should be disposed to lend a copy of my *MS.* summary of it, to any respectable Friend who might be desirous to publish it, and to avail himself of the assistance of my papers.

I have so frequently expressed as an Appellant, in the plainest and strongest terms I could use, my objection to the imposition of unscriptural articles of faith, in any form, or under any pretext, that it is unnecessary to repeat them here, but as the right of imposing such articles on me, or of expelling me from that Society in which it pleased an all-wise Providence that I should be born and educated, has in reality been the point at issue between my accusers and myself; I would close this preface by expressing my sincere good wishes

for the welfare and prosperity of the Society, and by quoting a very impressive testimony of John Locke, against subjection to any similar imposition.

After having most clearly shewn from the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, that in the primitive Christian church, no other article of belief was required of converts to the faith that Christ and his Apostles preached, than that "*Jesus is the Messiah the Son of God,*" he says,* "I allow to the makers of systems and their followers, to invent and use what distinctions they please and to call things by what names they think fit: but I cannot allow to them, or to any man, an authority to make a religion for me, or to alter that which God hath revealed. And if they please to call the believing that which our Saviour and his Apostles preached, and proposed alone to be believed a *historical* faith, they have their liberty; but they must have a care how they deny it to be a justifying or saving faith, when our Saviour and his Apostles have declared it

* "Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures," last Edit. p. 147. Johnson & Co. London, price in boards, 3s. 6d, including a short account of the life and writings of the Author, with his celebrated "Essay for the understanding of St. Paul's Epistles, by consulting St. Paul himself."

so to be, and taught no other which men should receive, and whereby they should be made believers unto eternal life; unless they can so far make bold with our Saviour for the sake of their beloved systems, as to say that he forgot what he came into the world for; and that he and his apostles did not instruct people right in the way and mysteries of salvation."

ERRATA.

Page 34, line 20, for "observed," read *proposed.*
—— 72, line 2, note, for "§ Mark xii. 29," read *Rom. xiv.* 4.
—— 94, line 8, note, for "It was," read *It is.*
—— 97, line 30, note, for "of ancients," read *of the ancients.*
—— 100, line 21, note, for "he add," read *he adds.*

APPEAL,

&c.

By the constitution of the society of Friends, usually called Quakers, the rights of membership are guarded with peculiar care. Every member disowned by any Monthly Meeting is entitled to appeal against its judgment, to the Quarterly Meeting in whose district it is situated.

This right I exercised, and considering the decision of the Quarterly Meeting in my case, as tending to encourage by its influence an intolerant spirit, injurious to the interests of truth and virtue, I published as correct a Narrative of the proceedings as was in my power, that their true character might be generally understood. So far as this decision is acted upon as a precedent, it is evidently calculated to discourage among the members of the society, by the fear of censure and disownment, an open profession of their own convictions concerning the doctrines of the New Testament, or even the religious tenets of the founders and most approved authors of the society.

Much disposed as I was to wave the farther exercise of the rights of appeal, I chose to preserve them

as long as the rules allowed, and therefore gave the following notice

To the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, to be held 3d Month 30th, 1813.

Dear Friends,

It has been with much reluctance on various accounts, that I have at length concluded to give you notice of appeal to the Yearly Meeting against your judgment.

In the exercise of this right, however, I think my resolution is unalterably fixed to occupy but very little of the time of the Meeting, or of its Committee. The probable advantages of *another* personal discussion of the case, do not appear to me important enough, to reconcile me to being the cause of prolonging the sittings of that Meeting to the necessary, and perhaps great inconvenience of many friends.

My object is rather to give the society an opportunity of doing itself justice, by calmly reconsidering a decision, which may soon become a precedent injurious to its welfare, and unfavourable to its progressive improvement, than to urge the reversal of a sentence confirmed by you, which I deem truly honourable to me, *as a Christian*, because, if I understand its import, it disowns me as a member of your religious society, for openly professing my belief concerning Jesus Christ, *in scriptural terms*, and for refusing to adopt *any other*.

The Yearly Meeting in 1794 resolved " not to receive in future any appeal in print, or that hath been printed." I shall *continue* to avoid, to the best of my judgment, any infringement of this rule, but I shall nevertheless hold myself at full liberty, to publish a narrative of the *previous* proceedings in my case, before my intended appeal to that meeting is presented or prepared.

So salutary do I deem it, that all persons in whom judicial powers are vested, should exercise them, as under the eye of the public, or rather with a consciousness that they are liable to publicity, that I should readily wave the privilege of appeal as illusory and of little value, under any system which fettered or prohibited such a right.

Earnestly wishing that we may more and more, to our unspeakable advantage "*let this mind be in*" *us* "*which was also in Christ Jesus*," I am your sincere friend, THOMAS FOSTER.

Bromley, March 29th, 1813.

This notice being read, *six* respondents were appointed to defend the decision of the Quarterly Meeting, viz. George Stacey, William Allen, Luke Howard, John Eliot, Josiah Forster and Richard Bowman.

At length I learnt that a publication was circulating containing such charges against me, as I could not with propriety pass over in silence, countenanced as the work had been, though previously disposed to avoid any farther controversy with the society.

I ventured however to hope, that by a plain statement and refutation of these charges, though they had been sanctioned by the "Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders," the appointed censors of the press, and directed to be circulated throughout the society, by the "Meeting for Sufferings," that body might be induced to withdraw its farther countenance from the work. With these views I addressed the following letter

To the Meeting for Sufferings, to be held 11th Month 5th, 1813.

DEAR FRIENDS,

IN "a list of Friends' books now on sale," published

in your name, pursuant to a minute of 9th month 3d last, " for the general information of Friends;" there is one pamphlet which contains various false and injurious charges and insinuations, tending especially by the countenance you have given it, to prejudice the minds of Friends in every part of the kingdom against me, while the Appeal to the Yearly Meeting, of which I have given due notice, is pending.

This work is entitled, " Remarks suggested by the perusal of a Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism, &c." It was published during the last Yearly Meeting, and sold in common with other Friends' books, at the Clerk's Office, Devonshire House; and, as I now understand by your minute, " with the approbation of the Morning Meeting" of Ministers and Elders.

Soon after it came out, I read it attentively, but without being able to discover its pertinency to the subject of which it treats; and supposing it, *till very lately*, to be merely the unsanctioned effusion of an individual, I did not incline to notice either the palpable misrepresentations with which it abounds, or the author's reasoning, of which it contains some very singular specimens.

When such a production is officially sent forth by you " for the general information of Friends," with a recommendation, that two copies be taken by every Monthly Meeting, and one copy " kept in each Quarterly Meeting," it acquires a claim to notice of which I before thought it wholly undeserving. I nevertheless highly esteem the character of its author, as a benevolent and amiable man and a sincere Christian, but I cannot commend his candour or accuracy as a writer; nor think that such a work merited the distinguished countenance it has obtained. But I solicit your attention to its contents, so far only as they are calculated to excite unjust prejudices, even in the minds of those who may become judges of my appeal. I shall thus trespass upon your time more than I could wish, yet it would

be evidently improper to prefer these complaints, without distinctly specifying the grounds on which they rest.

1. Your approved author begins by asserting that "MANY attempts have lately been made by *Unitarian writers* to identify their faith with that of the Quakers, but—sometimes—rather covertly than openly," and that "The 'Devotional Extracts' were given to the world *with this design*."

Whether the first of these assertions be correct or not, the latter is wholly unfounded. The work alluded to, is entitled, "Devotional and Doctrinal Extracts from Epistles of the Yearly Meetings in London, of the people called Quakers, from the year 1678 to 1810." Many of you know that long before the Remarks you have sanctioned were published, I avowed myself the Editor of this work, in the Quarterly Meeting which heard my appeal. My professed and real design was not "to identify" the faith of any other class of Christians "with that of the Quakers," but to evince the general soundness of the devotional language of our predecessors by unexceptionable evidence, and to contribute so far as in my power to "the preservation of my brethren, in an undeviating and consistent profession of that great and fundamental doctrine of the Scriptures, *the unity of God*."

2. Your approved author says, "*This design of identification* is however no longer *a secret:* it is brought forward in no dubious form in the 'Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism, by William Penn; with a modern sketch of reputed Orthodoxy, and real intolerance, by Ratcliff Monthly Meeting.'"

The design of William Penn in publishing the work here called a "Portraiture" is much too plain to be any "secret," to those who read it with attention. He intended it as a defence of the unity, mercy and purity of God; and as a confutation of those so generally-believed and applauded doctrines of the

Trinity, a plenary satisfaction and an imputative righteousness. Such was my design in the republication of this Tract, and not to compare, much less "to identify" the faith of those who are usually called Unitarians, "with that of the Quakers." The "sketch" contained not an ex parte statement in my favour, but correct copies of all the minutes of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting relative to my case, with a few explanatory notes. Those minutes, and Penn's Tract form a contrast as striking as I can readily imagine.

3. Your approved author adds, "It may perhaps be suspected that this pamphlet was intended to sell as the work of the Ratcliff Monthly Meeting: though candour would instantly reject such a suspicion, *were it not already authorized* by the publication of a version of the New Testament, sanctioned by the name of Archbishop Newcome." The version here alluded to, if I understand your author, is entitled "The New Testament in an improved Version upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome's new Translation." But this is not to claim his sanction in favour of the work farther than is proper, as all deviations from the Primate's text, are carefully marked, and his reading given at the bottom of the page. Nor can this publication, whatever be its merits or demerits, authorize a "suspicion" which your approved author says "candour" would otherwise "instantly reject."

4. He next tells us that "The title given to the 'Devotional Extracts' also, and the manner of its publication, *were equally calculated to deceive.*" How so? The title as given above, is, I submit to you, as expressive of the contents of the work, as any I could have chosen. The extracts were selected one or more from each Epistle, from 1678 to 1810. They are generally devotional or doctrinal, and the most appropriate I could find. With what justice then can this title be described as "*calculated to deceive?*"

5. Your approved author however says he "*was*

himself deceived," and that " he knows of some others who eagerly inquired after the work, believing it to be sanctioned by the society of Friends." What then? How could the Editor of that work prevent those persons from believing without evidence, or being deceived for want of proper inquiry, when the means were at hand? The conclusion of the preface might have informed them, that the Editor was far from attempting to give his work any other sanction than the pertinency and fidelity of his selection. For he there informs his readers, that " as a knowledge of the name of *the person* by whom this selection was made, cannot assist any one in appreciating its value or the inferences justly deduceable from it, he has not given it. But that if it should be thought necessary in any way to notice this work, the Editor may be called PHILEMON." There was therefore no just ground for representing, that " the manner" in which this pamphlet was published, was in any degree " *calculated to deceive.*"

6. Your approved author apparently forgetting his suspicion that the Portraiture, &c. " was intended to sell as the work of the Ratcliff Monthly Meeting," informs us that " as it appears to be brought forward by a person *born* and *educated amongst the Quakers*, it may be the more likely to pass for a full exposition of their doctrines."

With some persons it may, but not with those who examine before they judge. Such persons as the " deeply thinking men," for whom your approved author tells us he has " often felt compassion," would be likely with all the infirmities he imputes to them to judge better. Nor could any reasonable man consider this tract as containing " *a full exposition*" of any doctrines but those above-mentioned. It professes to treat of no others.

7. After two desultory paragraphs which affect not my reputation, but rather your's who have sanc-

tioned this work, your author tells us that Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken "professes to attack *all* that is of *mere human authority and invention* in the tenets that relate to the Trinity, imputed righteousness, and the satisfaction and atonement made by Christ."

This is not much amiss, but I think Penn explains his professed design more definitely and correctly in his preface to this work. He there says, he has "endeavoured *a total enervation* of those cardinal points, and chief doctrines so firmly believed, and continually imposed for articles of Christian faith."

8. Your approved author says also, that it "gave *great offence* to professors of different churches" in Penn's time. It did so *to Trinitarians*, but not to his brethren *the primitive Quakers.* Your author adds, "rude as that age was, it did not refuse to William Penn, like the Unitarians of the present, the privilege of explaining his own words: and though he was imprisoned for his book, yet his gaoler was not ordered to put a gag in his mouth, *as his present inquisitors do*, when he would open it for his justification."

No part of this grave accusation, sanctioned as it is by you, is well founded. To republish one of Penn's tracts, is rather to open than to shut the mouth of its author, and to style those who have been so usefully employed "inquisitors," is most absurdly to call names.

9. "We will remove this obstruction," continues your approved author, "and Penn shall *speak for himself*, bringing in his hand 'Innocency with her open face,' which if I mistake not, will occasion some surprize in the minds of those, who have hitherto been introduced to this amiable writer *only through the medium of Unitarian quotation.*"

Is it then a distinguishing character of Unitarians, rather to republish a whole work than to risk exhi-

biting the sense of an author imperfectly? It should seem so by the above passage. As to the "*surprize*" your author anticipates in the minds of his readers, should they be persons of much reflexion I conceive it will not be that such a tract as the Sandy Foundation Shaken, was selected for republication, but that its author, having therein spoken for himself so ably and scripturally, should under any circumstances have written such an Apology for that work. He undoubtedly deemed them consistent with each other, if he was, as I believe him to have been *a man of integrity*. For in the latter, there is no confession whatever that there are any unsound or unscriptural doctrines in the former. Yet so decidedly opposed is it to the doctrine of the Trinity, according to your approved author, that he represents its readers, as introduced to the writings of William Penn, "*only through the medium of Unitarian quotation!*"

10. In order to remove "this obstruction," as he calls it, your author, in the midst of his "Remarks" provides his readers with a copy of the aforesaid "Apology," but without any comparison of the two tracts, or attempting to vindicate the consistency or sincerity of William Penn in writing the latter, he says, p. 21, "Not doubting that the perusal of the tract here offered to the public has produced very opposite emotions in different classes of readers, I beg leave to offer some few observations on the 'Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism.' The concluding remark in the author's preface, *plainly declares* that the design of this book is *the identification* of *the Quaker* and *the Unitarian doctrines*. Speaking of the 'Sandy Foundation,' he observes, 'than which I am not acquainted with a more manly and able vindication, in that peculiarly fanatical age of *the pure Unitarian doctrine*.'"

This is comparatively candid, because any attentive reader may see, that the evidence appealed to as so

plain, will not support the conclusion. I did not speak in that place of *the doctrines* of Unitarians generally, but of the *pure* Unitarian *doctrine*, as it was laid down by William Penn, and defended in that work. This charge therefore is groundless. Nor is that which follows any better founded. The preface and postscript to Penn's "Sandy Foundation Shaken," were omitted as relating to a personal controversy, and as containing other irrelevant matter, of which the two quotations adduced by your author afford "sufficient evidence."

11. In the year 1771, an edition of Penn's *Select* Works was published by the Society, in the preface to which the editors very properly remark, that "Much might here be said on subjects so extensive as the life and writings of our author; but we refrain, lest in offering our own sentiments concerning them, we might seem to be endeavouring to prepossess the reader in their favour." This preface being prefixed to the "Portraiture," your author seems to have most strangely mistaken *the above sentiment*, if not the whole preface, *for mine;* and under this impression he gives the substance of it, marked with inverted commas, as a correct quotation, in the following terms and manner. "Much," says the painter of this Portraiture "might be said on the life and writings of William Penn, but he would not prepossess the reader in favour of his own sentiments." Your approved author then exclaims, "*Of this trait of delicacy let every one form his own opinion*, while I assist this author in examining his favourite identity, by scattering a few more quotations from William Penn."

Be it so. Let every one also judge what dependence can safely be placed on the accuracy of such a writer, or on the discrimination of those who revised and sanctioned his work.

12. Your approved author, under the influence of

equally gross misconception, brings forward p. 28, a much more serious accusation, but without any evidence to support it. He there says, "Though the Quakers have no written creeds, the acknowledgement of which constitutes a sole *right to membership*, yet whoever imagines, *as may well be imagined from the writings of Verax*, that a man *still professing* to be *a disciple of Mahomet*, *may yet be a Quaker*, is greatly mistaken."

Without doubt he is. But this defamatory insinuation, that the writings of Verax have a natural tendency to produce such an erroneous notion, is entirely unfounded. Many, if not most of you knew, before the "Remarks" you have sanctioned were published, that I was accused before the Quarterly Meeting of being the author of the writings alluded to; and that a number of passages were adduced from them against me, but that none of these held forth any thing approaching the monstrous proposition, "that *a professed disciple of Mahomet*," may yet be intitled to claim membership in a Christian church.

Such an extravagant idea, countenanced as this accusation is by you, is utterly incompatible with the whole tenor of those works. The one is intitled, "A Vindication of *Scriptural Unitarianism*, and some other Primitive *Christian Doctrines*;" the other "*Christian Unitarianism Vindicated*." Long before the date of your minute, declaring the "Remarks" to have been duly sanctioned, and directing them to be generally distributed throughout the Society, I had publicly avowed myself to be the author of both those works. There can therefore scarcely be a doubt to whom this heavy charge was intended to apply. Yet I may safely challenge any person to cite a single passage in those works, which can in the slightest degree justify this accusation. Such a thought never entered my mind till your approved author suggested

it, much less had I ever expressed it verbally, or in writing.

13. Nor does it appear, as he imagines, from the writings of Verax, "as the assumption of *a new power*, by the Quakers of the present age to expel *non-conforming members*." Verax knew very well that the power of expulsion has been freely exercised in every period of their history, and he believes often unnecessarily and unwisely. The cases of George Keith and Hannah Barnard are very unfitly compared by your author. There is no similarity between them, either as to the points in question, the conduct of the parties disowned, or, of the society, but rather a perfect contrast. George Keith attempted to impose upon his brethren unscriptural articles of faith; Hannah Barnard set up no such pretension. The church evinced an unequivocal disposition to tolerate the speculative errors of the former, although it at length disowned him. The latter was disowned, not for interfering with the Christian privileges of others, but because the church would not tolerate *the conscientious exercise of her own.*

Having finished his observations on the "Portraiture," your approved author says, p. 29, "I would gladly avoid all remark on the Appendix to this little volume. *It is almost impossible to speak of it without being personal.*"

Why so? The proceedings, it is true, relate to an individual. But the general principles on which they appear to be founded, present by far the most important objects for consideration. The soundness of these might be instructively discussed without any personal allusion. For instance, the propriety of accusers questioning persons suspected of holding erroneous opinions on points of doctrine, or, sitting in judgment on their own accusations.—The consistency and utility of unscriptural articles of faith in Protestant churches—of imposing such tenets on pain of

expulsion from religious fellowship; with various other topics equally interesting to the cause of Christian truth, and the rights of conscience might be considered as general propositions, without any personal reference The documents in this appendix, seem to me such as naturally lead a serious and reflecting mind to such considerations. Your approved author appears to think otherwise, and can hardly speak on the subject, "*without being personal.*" I wish him and you calmly to consider the cause of this.

14. Persisting in this course, after informing his readers that he laments my "perceptions—were not more alive to prudence than to give this appendix to the public," your approved author insinuates, but as usual without any evidence, that I have ventured to "*tell a large body of intelligent people, that they know not what they believe.*" If he, or you can shew I have so done, I will promptly condemn my conduct, as highly indecorous and improper, but I am not conscious that I ever so expressed myself as to deserve such censure.

15. Your approved author reasons thus in the next paragraph, concerning the manner in which he supposes I have acted. "If Verax," says he, "could *persuade* the Quakers to be Unitarians, he might tell the world so, and they would have nothing to complain of against him: but publicly to persist in *this attempt*, in spite of their loudest appeal to the contrary, is, let him clothe it with as much *affected meekness* as he *please*, an act of *great arrogance.*—— What is offensive to individuals is offensive to societies. The public is no more to be *compelled* to the yoke of matrimony than an individual, and all attempts beyond the freedom of choice, mar the work they would promote."

Certainly they do. Nor has Verax at any time made such attempts. He may have endeavoured to

"persuade" his brethren the modern Quakers, to adhere to the doctrines concerning the unity of God, which he believes the Scriptures *most plainly teach*, and their ancestors *openly professed*. "Publicly to persist in this attempt"—to persuade, is according to your author "*an act of great arrogance*." Whether this be a logical deduction, or a scriptural inference, I leave you to consider, as having recommended this work to the general attention of Friends. That it is directly calculated, if not designed to excite powerful prejudices against me, in the minds of many of those who may become the judges of my appeal, cannot I think be doubted. Nor will such persons, generally speaking, be likely to read any of the writings of Verax, or to have any other means of comparing the allegations against me, in this patronized work, with the evidence on which they must rest, if they are in any respect well founded.

In his last paragraph your approved author says, "The writer of these remarks has attempted *no kind of argumentation*." The natural tendency of this this observation, at the conclusion of his work, on those who receive it as being "sanctioned by the Society of Friends," is surely to impress them with a belief that it contains so correct a detail of plain undisputed matters of fact, as can admit of no question, and on which every reader of it, without farther information is competent to decide.

Whether this, or any thing like this, be the real fact, I call upon you as Christians conscientiously to examine, after maturely weighing the evidence I have thought it my duty, more for your sakes, and that of the Society, than my own, thus to lay before you. Try it by the golden rule of *our common Lord and Master*, and if you find it will not bear that test, hesitate not to act as a sense of justice may dictate.

For my own part I cannot suppose the various accusations against me in the work thus sanctioned,

have been investigated by you, or by the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders, *with sufficient attention.* If they had, I am persuaded you would not have given them your countenance.

It is not my place to point out, how the injury of which I complain, may now be most properly and effectually redressed, but it will become your duty to consider this, if, on a review of the manner in which you have distributed and recommended this work, you should be convinced, that you have not only by so doing, injudiciously implicated the reputation of the Society, but contributed to do me great injustice.

Before I conclude, I must say, if the rules of the discipline are to be impartially administered, and "*Defamation and detraction*" really *discouraged*, my claim upon you for reparation *is strong*, and requires your *serious attention*, in proportion to the importance of the station you occupy, the publicity you have given to a work, containing injurious aspersions on my character, and the extent of your collective influence over the Society.

Earnestly desirous of its real welfare and progressive improvement in "*Christian knowledge and the practice of virtue*," I am sincerely your well-wishing friend, THOMAS FOSTER.

Bromley, Nov. 1st, 1813.

In order to preserve my rights as an appellant, I gave the following notice.

To the Quarterly Meeting for London and Middlesex, to be held 12th Month 28th, 1813.

DEAR FRIENDS,

IN the 3d month last I gave you due notice of appeal, but it not being "convenient" to me, to present the same "to the Yearly Meeting next ensuing," I hereby repeat notice thereof conformably to the 6th rule concerning appeals.

In my former notice I intimated to you, that I meant "to occupy but very little of the time of the Meeting, or of its Committee." Since that time I had almost given up all thoughts of appealing, but now deem it an incumbent duty to claim the *full* exercise of that right, in consequence of a pamphlet containing many unfounded and injurious charges and reflexions on my character, having "been published with the approbation of the Morning Meeting" of Ministers and Elders.

This work is intitled "Remarks suggested by the perusal of a Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism, &c." and is recognized as having been *so approved and published*, by a printed minute of the Meeting for Sufferings, dated 9th month 3d last, which recommends it to be circulated within "each Quarterly—and Monthly Meeting—for the general information of Friends," manifestly calculated as it is, to excite powerful and extensive, but unjust prejudices against me while my appeal is pending.

To remain longer silent after I *at length knew* that the system of "Defamation and detraction" under which I had long suffered, was thus widely extended and openly sanctioned by the constituted authorities of the Society, would in my mind have been a criminal dereliction of an important Christian duty. I therefore feel myself called upon to engage *once more*, in a very unequal and unpromising contest, but remain with best wishes for your present and future welfare, your sincere friend, THOMAS FOSTER.

Bromley, *Dec. 26th*, 1813.

On this notice being read, it was observed, as I understand by George Stacey, that it was doubtful whether the Yearly Meeting would hear the appeal, on two grounds:—1st. The appellant would be expected to assign some very good reasons why he did not bring forward his appeal at the last Yearly Meeting:—2dly. He had published a narrative of the

proceedings of the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings relative to the case.

As to the first observation Joseph Gurney Bevan, as I am informed said, "It had no weight with him, as the rules allowed appellants to judge for themselves, within the time limited, when it was most convenient to them to present an appeal. As to the other objection, it was not for that meeting to judge of it, but to proceed at a proper time to nominate respondents, as the appellant had given regular notice according to the rules." This was accordingly done.

The following letter will shew in what manner my letter to the Meeting for Sufferings was disposed of.

To Sparks Moline and Josiah Messer.

Dear Friends,

You were, I understand, desired to examine a sealed letter, which I addressed to the Meeting for Sufferings, held 11th month 5th last; and that seeing it came from me and just the beginning of it, you reported, without reading it, that it was not proper to be laid before the meeting, and did not concern them. About three weeks after Sparks Moline gave me this information verbally, and assured me the letter had been ever since in his possession, and had not been read even by himself.

During the conversation between us, I read one passage, which appeared fully to satisfy him, that I had been grossly calumniated in the approved work to which my letter related. He took it back with him, and yesterday informed me, that you had since that time perused it, but remained of the same mind.

He also shewed me a letter on the subject from Josiah Messer to himself, briefly stating his [Josiah's] concurrence in the reasons he had assigned why you declined laying my letter before the meeting.

These reasons are far from being satisfactory to me, and are I think highly derogatory to the character of the Meeting for Sufferings, as a standing Committee of the Yearly Meeting.

I hope you will not however shrink from the duty of furnishing me with those reasons in writing, that I may clearly understand them, and avoid as I wish all misrepresentation. Common civility, as well as justice requires this, and I hope Josiah Messer's letter to Sparks Moline will be carefully preserved, as I may have important occasion to refer to it.

I shall be very ready to meet in any fair manner, the irrelevant accusations it contains whenever Josiah Messer may choose to state the particulars of the alleged misrepresentation, and if his complaint should appear to be well founded, to make reparation, as broad and public as the injury.

I am, with due respect,

THOMAS FOSTER.

Bromley Hall, Jan. 23d, 1814.

Receiving no answer to this letter, I concluded that a small junta had taken upon themselves to determine, that my letter to the Meeting for Sufferings ought not to be laid before them; I therefore sent the following letter to that meeting by Thomas Sturge, one of its members.

Thomas Foster, to the Meeting for Sufferings, to be held 2d Month 4th, 1814.

DEAR FRIENDS,

I ADDRESSED a *sealed* letter to you, which was referred 11th month 5th last to a committee of two of your members, one of whom about three weeks after verbally informed me, that *without reading it*, but just the beginning only, they had reported it was not

proper to be laid before you! Since this time, they have been induced to peruse it, and I am *lately* informed are still of the same mind, on such grounds as I think you should be acquainted with.

The letter related to a work which contains unfounded and injurious aspersions on my character, and which, by a printed minute of 9th month 3d last, you certify to have been published with the approbation of the Morning Meeting, and recommend to be circulated, "for the general information of Friends."

Your Committee, much to my surprise alleged, that you are *obliged* to circulate all works which have been *so sanctioned*, that you have no constitutional power to act otherwise, it being the business of the Morning Meeting, to take care that those publications, contain nothing contrary to the doctrines of the Society.

If you really occupy so subordinate a station in the Society, and are so completely under the direction and controul of the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders, I have hitherto much mistaken your collective character, as a standing Committee of the Yearly Meeting, empowered to act on its behalf, in the intervals between one meeting and another, in whatever concerns the general welfare and reputation of the Society, which is not otherwise provided for by its rules. Such I submit to you, is the case to which I solicit your attention.

I am aware that the revision of *MSS.* intended for publication, *at the expense of the Society*, has been *long* intrusted to the Morning Meeting, but if any thing palpably exceptionable should escape their notice, in the exercise of this *delicate trust*, which ought to be very judiciously executed, *or not at all*, surely you are duly authorized, on the same being pointed out to your conviction, to decline giving such a work farther publicity, and to withdraw your countenance. The object of my letter was to call upon you calmly

to consider whether the case it states, has not such a claim to your notice, on the broad principles of impartial justice.

Your Committee represent you as incompetent to entertain such a question. *One of them* is a member of the Morning Meeting, and may be strongly biassed in favour of its decision in this instance, and in supporting its claims to authority in matters of faith and worship. *The other*, long after their report to you concerning my letter, professed to be equally unacquainted with your minute, and the work to which that letter related! It concerns your reputation, and that of the Society, that it should be known, whether you are at liberty in such cases, to act as your own judgment may dictate, or are intirely submissive to the ecclesiastical mandate of others.

In my former letter, I confined myself as much as I well could, to such parts of the work declared by your minute to have so sanctioned, as directly tended to excite unjust prejudices against me, while my appeal to the Yearly Meeting is pending. But I cannot conclude this letter, without pointing your attention to one paragraph in this approved work, which so decidedly holds up "the *common* doctrine of the Trinity," as according with the principles of the Society, that it represents those, who may wish to give them a character "irreconcileable" to that doctrine, as "endeavouring to consign the Quakers to the invidious condition of the Bat in the fable, neither bird nor beast, *with all its pernicious consequences.*"

What these may be, your approved author has not explained. But they can hardly be any other, than such as every sincere lover of truth should be prepared to encounter, the loss of the praise of men for reputed orthodoxy, the proper value of which, Christ taught his disciples, how to estimate and despise. There can however be no difficulty in ascertaining

where "the *common* doctrine of the Trinity" is to be found. That is, in the *Athanasian creed.* A mass of contradictions and absurdities, too monstrous to have been imposed as an article of faith, during the darkest ages of the Romish church, by any person while living, however great his reputation, in his own name. No; it was the offspring of fraud and forgery never seen or heard of, till long after the decease of its reputed parent, under the sanction of whose name it was introduced.

Yet is this figment of Popery "*the common doctrine of the Trinity,*" thus brought forward under the sanction of an imprimatur rule, as consistent with the principles of the Society! If such be the fact, I may lament it for the sake of many of those who are still your members, but I shall rejoice at my own emancipation. And I know there are many among you, who cannot for conscience' sake receive this newly-adopted tenet, and bow down to the unscriptural image it sets up, or so teach their children.

Look ye to it, and judge for yourselves whether this be that faith, "which was once delivered to the saints," and will be finally triumphant, by whomsoever it may be opposed.

This work you may therefore see has other claims to your notice, as you have given it such extensive publicity and countenance, than those which arise out of the injustice it does me. Read, examine, deliberate, and then do that which you believe to be right, but do not in blind submission to the unconstitutional authority of others, refuse to bring your own deeds to the light, and to hear evidence concerning them which is justly entitled to your attention. I remain, with best wishes, your sincere friend,

THOMAS FOSTER.

Bromley, Feb. 1*st.* 1814.

I sent this letter *unsealed,* in order that it might,

according to the usual practice be read in the meeting; without being first referred to a Committee. I was informed how it was disposed of by the following note, but whether referred to the same Committee as my former letter I know not.

"Thomas Sturge informs Thomas Foster, that he presented his letter to the Meeting for Sufferings, and notwithstanding it was unsealed, after reading the superscription, it was concluded not to read it, but to refer it to two Friends to report upon: who went out with it, and on their return reported *that it was not a proper letter to be read in the meeting;* upon which it was given me to return to thee, which I do herewith.

Devonshire House, 2d Month 4th, 1814.

N. B. The marked words [those in italics] I believe to be the substance of the report, but not exactly the words, not being correctly clear in my recollection of them."

Being thus refused a hearing by those, who subsequent to my disownment had contributed as a collective body to the aspersion of my character as a man and a Christian, I had no other prospect of obtaining adequate redress than to claim a hearing as an appellant, in order to remove, if possible, the unjust impressions which had been so systematically and perseveringly made to my prejudice. Under these impressions I applied to the recording clerk for a copy of the existing rules concerning appeals, when I found to my surprise that the Meeting for Sufferings had taken upon themselves to suspend issuing the rules made by the last Yearly Meeting, for the better conducting appeals, and had even refused to several Quarterly Meetings copies of the same. I therefore sent to the next Quarterly Meeting the following letter.

To the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, to be held 3d Month 29th, 1814.

DEAR FRIENDS,

THE last Yearly Meeting, having as I understand made some fresh regulations concerning appeals, I lately applied to the clerk in whose custody the records are placed for general use, for a copy, that I might as an appellant duly observe them. But in consequence of certain directions given him since that time, he declined granting this reasonable request without your permission, or that of the Meeting for Sufferings.

I am therefore obliged either to risk forfeiting the right of appeal by not attending to those regulations, or to request you, or that meeting to direct the clerk to furnish me with a copy. It appears most regular to apply to you, as the Meeting for Sufferings does not officially know me as an appellant, and might therefore reject any application from me, as informal however proper in itself.

I also request you will authorize the clerk to allow me such access to the records of the Yearly Meeting, as I may judge necessary in preparing for my defence. Some of its judicial decisions and minutes, I have particular occasion to consult, and I trust you will be of opinion, this is a privilege, of which no appellant can be equitably or justifiably deprived.

I remain, with undiminished good wishes, your sincere friend, THOMAS FOSTER.

Bromley, March 26th, 1814.

On this letter being read by the clerk, a discussion took place. It was said, as I understand, that the appellant had requested more than the Quarterly Meeting had power to grant, the records being in the custody of the Meeting for Sufferings.

The person who started this objection (J. G. Bevan), should have been reminded, that he never hesitated to send the recording clerk out of the Quarterly Meeting for any part of those records to which he wished to refer, without asking leave of either of those meetings. Nor was the right of inspecting the records ever objected to within my knowledge till lately, but considered as a right to which every member of the Society was entitled.

It appeared, however, to be the decided sense of the meeting, that the requests of the appellant ought to be granted. John Eliot observed, that the respondents being members of the Meeting for Sufferings had of course free access to the records, and he therefore thought it would be unjust to deny the same privilege to the appellant. In this sentiment most of the persons who spoke concurred, but the Meeting for Sufferings not having sent to the Quarterly Meeting a copy of the new rules concerning appeals, and having lately directed their clerk not to permit any other persons but its members, to have access to the records, without their special leave, the Clerk was desired to inform that meeting of my application, and its opinion thereon, also to acquaint me in what manner they thought my requests should be granted.

This conclusion of the meeting was reported to me the same day by several of my friends who were present, and I accordingly expected it would have been promptly complied with. But I afterwards found this was a delusive expectation. For although the clerk understood very well what he was commissioned to do, as the organ of the meeting, he chose to inquire of a friend near him, whether it would not be proper to write a note to the appellant, to inform him of the conclusion of the meeting? This he was advised *in a whisper* would be unnecessary, as the appellant would no doubt apply to him soon enough.

The clerk acted upon this uncandid suggestion,

and although he attended the next Meeting for Sufferings which occurred in due course only three days after, he withheld the communication he was directed to make to that meeting, which separated without noticing the subjects of my letter to the Quarterly Meeting: yet most of its members were present at the discussion upon it, and knew the same were referred to their attention.

By these disingenuous measures, the consideration of the subjects referred to them by the Quarterly Meeting, was deferred till their next meeting, five weeks after, and the appellant consequently deprived during that period of any opportunity to inspect the records, after which if permission were granted, it was easy to foresee it would be of little use, as the Yearly Meeting so soon followed. I however addressed the following letter

To the Meeting for Sufferings, to be held 5th Month 6th, 1814.

Dear Friends,

I addressed a letter to the Quarterly Meeting held 3d month 29th last, requesting a copy of the regulations concerning appeals made by the last Yearly Meeting, and also such access to the records of that meeting, as I might as an appellant judge necessary in preparing for my defence.

These requests were I understand generally allowed to be reasonable. But it was thought most proper for you to give the necessary directions, and their Clerk was officially authorized to inform you that I am an appellant to the ensuing Yearly Meeting.

A few days after your next meeting was held in due course, at which I am told no notice whatever was taken of my application so referred to your attention, although many of you heard my letter read in the Quarterly Meeting, and the discussion thereon.

I should have been much better pleased for you to have taken the matter up spontaneously, without any farther communication from me, however you might have decided upon it.

Thrice have I already had just occasion to apply to you in the character of an appellant, and each time unsuccessfully. My two last letters had in my apprehension peculiarly strong claims on your justice, as they called upon you to consider what reparation was due to me, and in your power to make, for a serious and extensive injury which I had received, and to which you had materially contributed. Yet neither of these letters was even suffered to be read!

The request my first letter contained, you rejected without deigning to assign any reason for your refusal. It is again referred to your notice, as having the more immediate custody of the records of the Yearly Meeting.

While I was a member of the Society, I always considered the records as public property, and as such occasionally inspected and made extracts from them, without its having been ever objected to, till some time after the appointment of your present Clerk. But now it seems no persons in the Society are to be allowed these privileges except they are members of your meeting, or have first obtained your permission.

If such restrictions as these are deemed necessary, I am the less surprised at the difficulties thrown in the way of my obtaining as an appellant those rights which you deny to your own members.

The regulations of the last Yearly Meeting concerning appeals, are understood in several important particulars to be a great improvement upon the former practice. They are said to give an appellant a better chance of having unprejudiced judges, by allowing him to a reasonable extent, the right of challenge—and the aid of advisers in proportion to the number of respondents. These are salutary alterations in the rules, which evince a disposition to administer justice with impartiality. I trust you will agree with

me, that they cannot be too soon acted upon.* Under the former rules an appellant, although a female, was once denied the consolation of a single friend to attend her! The painful retrospect of the past compared with the spirit which these new regulations evince, affords a cheering prospect of increasing liberality, which I cannot view without feeling a sensible satisfaction.

Waiting your answer, I remain your well-wishing friend, THOMAS FOSTER.

Bromley, May 4th, 1814.

The requests in this letter so recommended to its attention, the meeting condescended to permit to be read, and were thereby incidentally informed of my feelings, on their refusal to consider the subject of my two former letters.

One of these requests they did grant, although they had hitherto suspended the publication of the rules to which it related, thereby usurping a power over the legislative authority of the Yearly Meeting, which they could not be entitled to exercise.

The other request they refused without assigning any reason for depriving an appellant of the right of access to the statute book of the Society. Had this request been submitted to them at their last meeting, as it ought to have been officially by the Clerk of the Quarterly Meeting, while the conclusion of that meeting was fresh in their recollection, I cannot suppose they would have come to such a decision. Soon after their Clerk furnished me with a copy of the following rules, intimating at the same time, that he had nothing else in commission from the meeting as to any other requests in my letter.

* In this particular I had been misinformed, as no such *aid* appears to be allowed appellants by the new rules. A proposal to that effect was I suppose made and discussed, but not agreed to by the Yearly Meeting.

Yearly Meeting, 1813.

After much solid and deliberate consideration, it is agreed that the following be the rules for conducting appeals in the Yearly Meeting.

1. That a Committee be annually appointed to hear and judge of such appeals. The Committee to consist of one representative from each meeting in Great Britain, which is represented in the Yearly Meeting. But in case the number of such meetings shall, at any time, be fewer than 28, the Meeting of Representatives shall nominate an additional one out of each Quarterly Meeting, in alphabetical order, which has not fewer than four representatives present, until the deficiency be supplied; beginning at any future time with the next meeting in rotation.*

2. That all the representatives from such meetings, do meet at the close of the first sitting, for the purpose of nominating the said Committee.

3. That every appeal be delivered to the clerk for the time being, before the close of the second sitting, in writing, sealed up; with an indorsement specifying the appellant and the meeting appealed against.

4. That on its appearing that due notice has been given, all the representatives be directed again to meet previously to the next sitting; the appellants and respondents being duly apprized of such meeting, and having the liberty to be present. That at this meeting, the nomination agreed to by the 2nd of these rules, be read over to each set of appellants and respondents, as they are respectively called in; and each side be allowed, if they see occasion, to object to any of the proposed Committee, not exceeding six respectively, assigning no cause for the same; and then, that both the appellants and respondents do

* The number of these meetings was formerly 40, or more. There are now only 28, and this article provides for a farther reduction, which is likely soon to take place.

withdraw. That if any of the Committee be so objected to, they be set aside, but as to that particular appeal only. That their places be supplied by the meeting of representatives, in like manner as the original nomination was made. That the Committee or Committees, as finally nominated, be reported to the third sitting of the Yearly Meeting; the names of the representatives from any meetings concerned in an appeal, being previously struck off from the list, as to that particular appeal.

5. That at a third sitting, all appeals be delivered to the Committee or Committees, in order to be immediately proceeded on; not less than 21 of the number appointed for a particular appeal, being at any time present thereon.

6. That the report of the Committee be read in the Yearly Meeting, in the presence of both parties, if they incline to be present; and that it be a final decision, except in matters of faith and principle; in which cases the party against whom a decision is given, may require to be heard by the meeting itself. If however in any case of appeal the report be not signed by at least 21 of the number for that appeal, either party may require to be heard in the Yearly Meeting.

7. That if any case be opened in the Yearly Meeting, the Committee of Appeals shall appoint two of their number to explain to the meeting, in the presence of the appellant and respondents the grounds of their decision, and of the dissent of any of the Committee who may withhold their signature.

In consequence of the foregoing regulations, the following rules in the Book of Extracts, under the head Appeals are made void, viz. Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10.

Copy. WILLIAM MANLEY.

A few days before the Yearly Meeting I received a letter, of which the following is a copy.

Tottenham, 13*th of* 5*th Month*, 1814.

RESPECTED FRIEND,

I WRITE this on behalf of the respondents in the case of thy appeal.

From the tenor of thy second or repeated notice to the Quarterly Meeting, [p. 15,] we conclude it is thy intention, should a Committee of Appeals confirm that meeting's decision, to require to be heard by the Yearly Meeting. On the other hand, should the Committee reverse the judgment already given, we think we should not fully discharge our trust, without claiming the exercise of the same right.

On these considerations, and from a desire that the time of the Yearly Meeting may not be needlessly protracted, we propose to submit to it a question, whether, under such intentions on both sides, the hearing by a Committee may not be at once dispensed with, and give place to that by the meeting itself.

If the question be thus submitted, it will be needful for thee to be at hand at the time of the presentation of the appeal to the meeting, in order to be admitted together with us, and unite in the proposal. Shouldest thou favour us with thy reply, it may be communicated by letter to thy sincere and well-wishing friend, LUKE HOWARD.

To Thomas Foster, Bromley.

My reply was as follows:—

Bromley, *May* 14*th*, 1814.

RESPECTED FRIEND,

I HAVE just received thy friendly letter, containing a proposal on behalf of the respondents on my appeal to the ensuing Yearly Meeting. As the oc-

casion for it appears to be grounded on the tenor of my renewed notice to the Quarterly Meeting, I have re-perused my copy of it, and cannot discover from what part of it you infer that it is my intention "to require to be heard by the Yearly Meeting," in case the decision of the Committee of Appeals should be against me, unless it may be from the use of the term "*full*" in that notice.

I did not use the term in that sense, nor mean to be so understood. It referred merely to the strong pledge I had given in my former notice of my desire "to occupy but very little of the time of the meeting or of its Committee;" because I foresaw that the circumstances which had induced me to resume the intention of appealing were likely on my part to take up more time, than I had previously resolved to devote to the whole of the case, if I went forward with my appeal.

After the intimation in my first notice, I felt it due to you, that I should explicitly state that I no longer held myself bound by it, but stood on the common ground of an appellant. I meant merely to imply this. I should not deem it decorous for any individual to predetermine not to be satisfied with the judgment of a Committee of Appeals; and with me a principal objection to your proposal is, that I do not see how I could be a party to it, without implying such a determination in the face of the Yearly Meeting at the opening of the business.

The case is widely different with you exercising a delegated trust on behalf of a large and respectable body. I am nevertheless as deeply impressed as I ever was how very undesirable any protracted personal discussion of the points at issue may be; and perhaps I cannot well give you a more decisive proof of this, than by saying that within the course of the last week, I have not only thought much, but consulted some of my friends respecting addressing a letter to you, in order if possible some arrangements might be agreed

on between us, that may save the time of the Yearly Meeting. And although I was advised to wave making any such proposal to you by letter, I had resolved on doing it when we met.

One other objection to your proposal strikes me, which perhaps I had better mention; and that is, whether it would not be to imply a disapproval of the important regulations made last Yearly Meeting, and thereby deprive its members at large of the advantages they seem calculated to confer, by making known, not only the decision of a Committee of Appeals, but the grounds of it. I observe this is required when the case is heard in the meeting, and where it is not in some instances it may be equally important.

I have no seal with so appropriate a motto, as thine "Nuncius Pacis," ornamented with the gospel emblem a dove, but I hail with pleasure the disposition thy letter evinces, and I trust in whatever way the points at issue may be heard, both parties will be animated by a wish to avoid all acrimony, or the introduction of extraneous matter, but above all by a love of truth in the first place—and of peace in the second. I am, very sincerely thy well-wishing friend,

THOMAS FOSTER.

To Luke Howard, Tottenham.

THE Yearly Meeting met on the 18th of May at ten. I was then informed by the Respondents, that having considered my letter they declined making any proposal to the Meeting, but intimated that it might be as well for me to be in waiting, for some time after my Appeal was presented, as the Meeting might have occasion to call for my attendance. I replied, it is my intention to be within call.

The meeting adjourned to four in the afternoon, when my appeal was laid on the table, sealed up and indorsed as the rules direct. I was soon informed by a message, that the *Representatives* would meet at the

close of the meeting, which took place a little after seven.

They met in the old meeting-house immediately. When the Respondents and myself were introduced, I was surprised to see so large an assembly. I estimated its number to be about 300; whereas, if it had been constituted of representatives only, as the rules direct, and every meeting had its full number present, those for London and Middlesex excepted, the whole number would only have been 112.*

The major part of the assembly was therefore probably composed of the *privileged orders*, Ministers, Elders, and the members of the Meeting for Sufferings, for I can hardly imagine any other members of the Society would intrude themselves on such an appointment.

After a short time of silence, the names of the Committee of Appeals chosen by a meeting *thus constituted*, were read. It consisted of the following names:—

Edward Bellis, Cheshire and Staffordshire.
Hadwen Bragg, Cumberland and Northumberland.
William Wilson, Durham.
Henry Ecroyd, Lancashire.
Isaac Bragg, Westmoreland.
John Hoyland, Yorkshire.
Anthony Wigham, Scotland.
Joseph May, Bershire and Oxfordshire.
Robert Horsenail, Kent.
William Chandler, Surrey and Sussex.
Thomas Seekings, Cambridge and Huntingdon.
Thomas Catchpool, Essex.
Jonathan Hutchinson, Lincolnshire.
Joseph John Gurney, Norfolk and Norwich.

* Viz. 4 for Scotland, 28 for the six Northern Quarterly Meetings, 16 for four of the Southern, 20 for the five Eastern, 24 for the six Western, and 20 for the five Midland.

Samuel Alexander, jun. Suffolk.
George Fisher, Bristol and Somerset.
Joel Lean, Cornwall.
Joseph Treffry, Devonshire.
William Byrd, Dorset and Hants.
James Petley, Glocester and Wilts.
Thomas Beavington, Hereford and Worcester.
Richard Summers Harford, Wales.
John Ransome, Bedford and Herts.
John Grant, Buckinghamshire.
Joshua Ransom Scales, Derbyshire and Nottingham.
Samuel Cook, Northamptonshire.
James Baker, Warwick, Leicester and Rutland.

The parties were now informed by the Clerk, that each might object to six of the names which had been read. My answer appearing to be first expected, I observed that the Friends nominated were so much strangers to me, that I should make no objection to any of them.

John Eliot observed, that the six Respondents who were all present, should withdraw with a list of the names to consider the nomination, and to depute one of their number to report thereon to the meeting. I expressed my concurrence in this proposal as being reasonable, although I had waved the exercise of the same right. The Respondents, however, without retiring acquiesced in the nomination which had been made, a list of which being given to the parties, they soon after withdrew.

Committee of Appeals, 1st Sitting at Gracechurch Street, 5th Month 19th, 1814, at Four in the afternoon.

The Respondents and myself having received notice attended accordingly, but were not called in till near six. On being admitted, it appeared that the Appeal had been opened and read. The Clerk of the

Committee suggested whether it would be necessary to read it *again*.

One of the respondents observed, it would certainly be proper to have it read in the presence of the parties, as the respondents were unacquainted with its contents. They might have added, that according to good order, and even the spirit of the rule, the seal of an appeal should never be broken previous to the hearing of the parties. For what purpose the usual practice was departed from in this instance, whilst the parties were known to be in waiting, the Committee did not explain. The promptitude with which they decided on the first objection urged by the respondents, may however throw some light on so singular a commencement of the exercise of judicial powers.

The Appeal was read again by Joseph John Gurney, who had been chosen Clerk of the Committee, or rather Chairman under that name. It is as follows:—

To the Yearly Meeting of Friends, to be held in London the 18th of the 5th Month, 1814.

THE Appeal of Thomas Foster, against the judgment of the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex sheweth,

1. That neither his being a subscriber to the London Unitarian Book Society, instituted for the promotion of Christian knowledge and the practice of virtue, "by inciting the attention of men *to the genuine doctrines of revelation*," as delivered in the Scriptures; nor his having promoted an examination of the Scriptural soundness of certain passages in a Yearly-Meeting Epistle, can he submits to you be justly deemed offences against the rules, or inconsistent with the principles of the Society.

2. That your Appellant for having thus unequivocally asserted the superior authority of Scripture in

all that relates to faith and worship; and for having subjected one of your Epistles to that test, the only criterion by which the truth of all the doctrines held by professed Christians ought to be tried, was accused by two Overseers of the Monthly Meeting, of which he was a member, of having "imbibed and aided in propagating some opinions contrary to the principles of the Society." In so accusing him, they admitted they did not act so much on their own judgment, as at the instance of many friends of other meetings, whose names they chose to conceal.

3. That the said Overseers though thus accusing your Appellant, could not with any consistency have intended to censure the fundamental principles of the London Unitarian Book Society, which they professed to consider unobjectionable. They are

"That there is but ONE GOD, the sole *Former*, *Supporter* and *Governor* of the Universe, the only proper object of religious worship; and that there is one Mediator between GOD and men, *the Man Christ Jesus*, who was commissioned to instruct men in their duty, and to reveal the doctrine of a future life."

Your Appellant submits to you that a careful examination of the following texts, Mark xii. 28—34, Acts xvii. 22—31, 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6, 1 Tim. ii. 1—5, 2 Tim. i. 1, 2, 7—10; not to mention many others, will prove those principles to be strictly scriptural, and sufficiently vindicate him for becoming a subscriber to this Book Society.

4. That the Monthly Meeting, without any adequate inquiry or evidence, recorded the aforesaid accusation, and appointed a Committee to visit your Appellant "thereon and report."

5. That the Committee so appointed, apparently sensible of the insufficiency of the original charges to justify disownment, paid very little attention to them, (though the sole ostensible objects of their appointment,) but exerted themselves to discover

fresh matters of accusation against your Appellant, by means of ensnaring interrogatories, on what they called "some important points of doctrine."

6. That their report to the Monthly Meeting manifests the inquisitorial character of the visits of this Committee, and their disposition to seek for additional accusations against your Appellant. This document speaks of "the eternal divinity—and omnipotence of Christ," and of "the propriety of applying to him in secret supplication."

The Committee who drew it up, nevertheless assured your Appellant at the first visit they paid him, that they never understood that the Society of Friends ascribed divinity to the man Christ Jesus, but to that divine power which dwelt in and acted by him. Hence your Appellant concluded they did not ascribe omnipotence to the Mediator of the new Covenant, nor consider him as the proper object of prayer. From this time, however, they refused to explain their accusations on these three "important points of doctrine," thereby leaving it wholly uncertain whether, on these subjects, there is any or what difference between their sentiments and those of your Appellant. His opinions on those points are grounded on the clear, decisive, and unequivocal letter and sense of Scripture. If you should judge he has mistaken their import, he trusts you will, if not for his sake, for that of the Church, explicitly say wherein you may think his mistake consists; and not like this Committee, shroud your own principles in obscurity, while you are condemning those of your Appellant.

7. That the Monthly Meeting acted with great precipitation in receiving and adopting the said report, and was not warranted by the letter or spirit of the rules of the discipline, or of gospel order, in directing on the credit of such a document, a "testimony of denial" to be prepared against your Appellant.

8. That the testimony of denial so prepared was adopted at the next Meeting, with equal precipitation, although it is still more objectionable and unjust than the Committee's report, with some parts of which it is absolutely inconsistent. It contains also additional and unfounded accusations; and your Appellant submits to you, that the Monthly Meeting was not justified by any rule of the Society, nor by any principles or precepts of the gospel in issuing the said testimony of denial.

9. That your Appellant, in due time, gave notice of appeal to the Quarterly Meeting; but before the same was presented, the Clerk, and afterwards the Meeting for Sufferings, refused him access to the records of the Society, some parts of which he had important occasion to consult in preparing for his defence. He has lately, as an appellant to you, repeated the same request by letter, with no better success, but he trusts you will manifest a more proper sense of impartiality and justice.*

10. That the Committee of the Quarterly Meeting, to whom the case of your Appellant was referred, decided a question on mere ex parte evidence, which was intended to deprive him of all the rights of an appellant, though they well knew that he had not forfeited those rights by the breach of any rule of the Society concerning appeals.

The hearing of the case was thus deferred about three weeks, when the Committee reported thereon in a manner which still farther evinced their want of impartiality, but it appearing that there was no foundation whatever for their objection, the Quarterly Meeting desired "the Committee to proceed with the business committed to it, and report. The most pertinent rule which could be adduced was read, and found to be nothing to the purpose, as it only pre-

* Very little objection was made by the Respondents to the general statement of facts in the preceding sections, and none which I deem worth notice.

cludes the reception and hearing of "any appeal in print, or that hath been printed.*

11. That although your Appellant was afterwards heard by this Committee with much patient attention, he submits to you that on several occasions they plainly indicated either very incorrect or partial views of some of the most essential principles of all regular judicial proceedings.

At one time they† proposed judging between the parties, not solely as justice required, on the original, or even on the recorded charges against your Appellant, but on the supposed errors he fell into in the course of his defence. At other times, after having perhaps justly informed him, that they judged he had laid before them some irrelevant matter, and admonished him not to deviate in a similar manner, they permitted the Respondents, without any admonition or restraint, to adduce against your Appellant whatever they chose, however irrelevant and unconnected with the original or any of the recorded charges against him. And on his objecting to the

* The Respondents desired the Committee of Appeals to compare the first-mentioned imputation of partiality in this section, with the first report of the Quarterly Meeting's Committee to that Meeting. The instance alluded to, is, I believe, correctly stated in my Narrative, pp. 136—139. And even this report implies that the Committee "considered" the "ex parte evidence" of the Respondents, without previously hearing the Appellant. It should also have stated, that they not only "considered" but made known their decision thereon to the parties, before "the Appellant had any opportunity given him" to shew the futility of the Respondents' plea. This decision was evidently intended to deprive him of his rights as an appellant; and the opportunity given him afterwards was plainly designed to accomplish the same object, by ensnaring interrogatories, which, taught by experience, he prudently refused answering.

† The imputation of partiality in the first part of this section, was said by Luke Howard, its Clerk, or more properly Chairman, not to apply to the Committee but to himself. The facts are, I believe, correctly stated in my Narrative, pp. 171, 172, and 179—181, consistently with which, instead of expressing myself as above, I admit I should have said, instead of "they," several of them proposed, &c.

very wide latitude they took under this licence, apparently forgetting their former decision, the Committee, by their Clerk, represented themselves "bound to hear whatever the Respondents chose to lay before them, and considered to be connected with the object of their appointment."

12. That your Appellant cannot say how far the Committee was influenced in its judgment, by the supplementary accusations which the Respondents were thus so improperly allowed, or rather encouraged to adduce against him. The final report of the Committee to the Quarterly Meeting only states, that they were "unitedly of the judgment that *the decision* of the Monthly Meeting *in relation to the Appellant* should *be confirmed.*"

Perhaps it was intended by these expressions, obscurely to intimate that the Committee did not approve *the proceedings* of the Monthly Meeting in relation to the appellant, nor *its decision* in favour of unscriptural articles of faith, *in relation to the Society.* The proceedings and the decision your Appellant submits to you, equally relate to both, and unless the proceedings can be generally justified as forming a precedent worthy of being approved and acted upon, in the regular administration of the discipline, *the decision* ought unquestionably to be reversed.

The Committee could scarcely have made so marked a distinction between the proceedings and the decision, and have limited their approval of the latter so singularly to its relation to the appellant, without some special design. The judgment was unanimous, and could not therefore have been intended to express or imply an approval of such proceedings as some of the most intelligent of its members had censured as unjust, and which none of them, in the hearing of your Appellant, attempted to defend.*

* The Respondents alleged, that it is not usual in the report of a Committee to state the grounds of its decision. This is surely rather to evade than to reply to the objections in this section.

13. That your Appellant expressing dissatisfaction with the aforesaid report, the case was, according to the rules, opened in the Quarterly Meeting; on his part principally by the appeal being read, and by his reading a written address. The Respondents were then heard in reply, and were allowed, without any interruption on the part of the Meeting, to adduce whatever accusations they chose against your Appellant, entirely unconnected as most of them were with the original charges against him.

When the Respondents had concluded their reply, the Meeting having sat long, your Appellant, from that consideration only, relinquished his intention of shewing, article by article, that the Respondents had not even attempted to controvert any material part of the allegations in his appeal. He contented himself with exposing some of the most palpable or injurious of their misrepresentations, but declined entering upon others which would have taken more time, assuring the Meeting he should rely on its not suffering itself to be biassed in its judgment by those unfounded and supplementary charges.

The parties having waved the right of being farther heard, were requested to withdraw; soon after which the Meeting adjourned to four the next afternoon.*

14. That every account your Appellant has received of the subsequent discussion in the absence of the parties, combines to impress him with a strong persuasion that the Quarterly Meeting did not in reality come to any proper or definite judgment upon either of the original, or even upon any of the recorded charges against him.

For it appears, on the concurring evidence of many credible witnesses, surprising as the fact is, that not one person who spoke in favour of confirming the

* The Respondents did not attempt to deny the truth of any part of this section.

judgment of the Monthly Meeting, uttered one syllable upon any of those charges; and that such of them as assigned any reasons for their judgment, grounded them entirely on the supplementary accusations, and principally on those to which your Appellant had declined replying, because he depended upon the Meeting not suffering itself to be warped in its judgment by them, much less by any repetition of the same, or the production of any other irrelevant charges.

The particulars of the Appeal were, it seems, not entered into, because it would have been "to enter into a wide field of investigation." How was this designed to be remedied? By a proposal for the Meeting to consider, "whether the appellant was, or was not, one in principle with Friends."

In what manner this question was intended to be examined, was not explained. But after several Friends had objected, in very strong terms, to the proceedings against your Appellant, as irregular, disorderly and indefensible, whose objections appear to have remained unanswered, it was erroneously stated to be "a very clear case that the appellant *is a member of another Society;*" and to be plain, "from an extract out of a work of his, read yesterday evening, that he rejected the well-known fundamental doctrine of the Society."

These were the apparent grounds of the Meeting's judgment, for no others, as your Appellant is credibly informed, were assigned, excepting the report of the Committee feeling pleasant to the mind of one friend, and another being much hurt by many things which had been said on matters with which he was not conversant, "but most of all by the extract above alluded to, which," he said, "opposed the doctrine of divine influence."

Yet from this extract, in connexion with the preceding or the following sentence, no such inference can be drawn, with any appearance of justice,

or even of plausibility. The passage altogether, rather supports than opposes the doctrine of divine influence. It was not written by your Appellant, and expressly quoted not to exhibit his own sentiments, but to shew " that the real difference of opinion between those who are supposed to take opposite sides of the question, *may not be so great as is generally imagined.*"

This attempt to promote a spirit of charity among Christians of different persuasions, was so misrepresented by the Respondents, that your Appellant has good reason to suppose that it made a greater impression on the Meeting to his prejudice than any thing else which was alleged against him. This passage, it may be said, notices a distinction between that diffusive gift which " the Father of mercies, the God of all comfort, hath given to every man to profit withal," from that extraordinary effusion of the holy spirit by which Jesus Christ and his Apostles were enabled to do many wonderful works. It does so. And so important is this distinction, that without making it, your Appellant does not perceive how any person can be properly said to be a believer in Christianity as a *special* revelation from God.*

15. That the minute of judgment made by the Quarterly Meeting, affords a strong presumption on the face of it; that it was not founded on any deliberate consideration of the charges and the proceedings against your Appellant. Like the report of its Committee, and in an equally pointed manner, it

* The Respondents observed that it was quite sufficient for the Friends, in the Quarterly Meeting, to express their concurrence with the report of the Committee, without assigning their reasons. Before the Committee of Appeals I granted this, provided a few Friends only had clearly assigned sufficient grounds to justify the decision, but that none should, as I am credibly informed was the fact, does appear very extraordinary, and fully justifies the above inferences. The Respondents candidly admitted, that the extract in this section, respecting divine influence, was introduced as here stated.

only expresses an approval of the decision of the Monthly Meeting *in disowning him*, without extending its approbation to its proceedings, or those of its Overseers and Committee. Your Appellant therefore submits to you, that so remarkable a coincidence of expression appears plainly to indicate a conviction on the part of the Meeting, that the proceedings on which that decision is founded, cannot be justified as regular and orderly.

The minute says, the meeting deliberately considered the case of your Appellant. Very well; this was one part of its duty. But what else did the meeting consider? The case the Respondents made out? Not a word like it in the minute of judgment. With what then did the meeting compare the case they considered so deliberately? With the reply of the Respondents? No such thing, so far as appears by this minute. The meeting seems to have weighed the case of your Appellant, not against any evidence or arguments they heard from the Respondents, but against the mere authority of its Committee's report, which throws no light whatever upon the subject; and to which your Appellant was constitutionally intitled to demur, to claim a hearing of the parties by the meeting, and a judgment wholly founded thereon, which by the positive testimony of this minute was pronounced on other and very different grounds.*

16. That deeply impressed as your Appellant was with the injustice of this decision, he was much more disposed to rely on other means of counteracting its operation as a pernicious precedent, than to seek the same object by an appeal to you. But since he has been intitled to those privileges which due no-

* The Respondents passing over in silence the inferences deduced in this section, pleaded the authority of the Committee's report as being more weighty than the reasoning of those who objected to the proceedings. And the very comfortable feelings of the Committee during the last half hour of their deliberations, were gravely urged as no slight evidence of the rectitude of their decision.

tice of appeal implies, and which a decent regard to your authority ought to have preserved inviolate, both have been invaded in an unprecedented and unjustifiable manner. A pamphlet containing various unfounded and injurious charges and reflexions on the character of your Appellant, was published at or before the last Yearly Meeting. For nearly six months he considered it as the unauthorized effusion of an individual, and as such undeserving any notice from him, however widely it might be circulated.

At length however he found, by a printed minute of the Meeting for Sufferings dated 9th month 3d last, that this work intitled "Remarks suggested by the perusal of a Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism, &c." was "published with the approbation of the Morning Meeting" of Ministers and Elders. Two copies of it are recommended to be taken by each Monthly, and one by each Quarterly Meeting—"for the general information of Friends," manifestly calculated as it is, to excite unjust prejudices against your Appellant. From whatever quarter those who are to be his judges may come, they cannot be supposed to have escaped its influence.

Such are the measures which have been resorted to, and so openly has the collective influence of "many friends of other meetings" been at length exerted against your Appellant, by giving their sanction and extensive publicity to this work, and he submits to you, by a misapplication of a rule of 1695, which relates only to such works as are published at the expense of the Society. If your constituted authorities act thus, towards those who are seeking redress at your hands, how can they expect an unprejudiced hearing and impartial justice? Or how can your judicial authority be permanently respected, if such conduct as this be connived at or encouraged?

Your Appellant presented a remonstrance to the Meeting for Sufferings on this occasion, which was disregarded. It was referred to two of its members,

who on seeing from whom it came, *without reading it*, reported, " that it was not proper to be laid before the meeting, and did not concern them!" Had this temperate remonstrance, which clearly stated the specific grounds of his complaint, met with any reasonable attention, it is highly probable it would have prevented this appeal to you. (See pp. 3—15.)

But to wave claiming a hearing, to which he is constitutionally entitled under charges thus assiduously accumulated against him by the hand of authority, might be thought to imply that he admitted them to be well-founded. Your Appellant cannot grant this; and conscious as he is of the difficulty of removing prejudices and wiping away accusations however groundless, which have been so openly, widely, and perseveringly disseminated, he claims the right of shewing them to be unfounded and injurious, before he enters upon the subjects more properly at issue between the Respondents and himself.

After hearing both parties fairly and fully, I presume it will become your province to decide the points at issue between them, which in effect are, whether the paramount authority of the Scriptures on all matters of faith and worship is to be acknowledged and respected, and the rights of conscience among your members to be preserved inviolate. Or, whether the Overseers, Elders, or Committees of your meetings for discipline, may at their own discretion question their brethren on points of faith, and impose on them for doctrines the commandments of men, to the obvious disparagement of the Scriptures, as if they do not contain a plain, intelligible and sufficient revelation of all necessary articles of Christian faith, and clearly point out the true object of supreme religious worship.

" The true worshippers," said our Lord and Master, " shall worship the Father." The first criterion in his estimation of all true worship. The second is equally essential, that it be " in spirit and in truth."

That you and I may "know what we worship," and not be ashamed of holding up before men the testimony of Jesus, concerning the alone true object of worship, is the sincere desire of your well-wishing friend, in the gospel of love and peace,

THOMAS FOSTER.

Bromley, May 16*th*, 1814.

The Appeal having been read, the Respondents objected to my being heard relative to the sanction given to the pamphlet alluded to in the latter part of it, or to any thing the Morning Meeting or the Meeting for Sufferings had done. We are appointed, said they, to defend the judgment of the Quarterly Meeting in this case, and have nothing to do *as Respondents* with that pamphlet, or with the manner in which it had been sanctioned and circulated.

I replied, that although the countenance which had been given to this work, was not the act of the Quarterly Meeting, *as such*, it was so far as I complained of it, the act of those who were its members, associated in a collective capacity *with others*, and diffusing by their united authority and influence unfounded and injurious prejudices against me. It was therefore highly reasonable that I should be allowed a little time to endeavour to remove those prejudices which had been thus excited. The objection of the Respondents seemed to imply, that I meant to call upon the Committee to give judgment on the case, which I did not, but merely to claim a hearing that I might if possible remove such erroneous impressions concerning my sentiments and conduct, as the work in question so sanctioned might have left on their minds.

Such a claim as this was never refused in courts of justice to any accused person, and when there was cause to apprehend that popular prejudice might endanger the impartial administration of justice, it was the practice to remove or delay the trial of the party. I trusted therefore that the Committee would not hesitate to allow me this privilege.

The Committee desired the parties to withdraw, that they might consider the Appellant's claim and the Respondents' objection.

On our being called in, a minute was read by the Clerk confirming the objection of the Respondents.

I requested a copy, which the Committee refused. I then urged them to reconsider a decision which appeared to me unjust in itself, and especially when I contrasted it with the unlimited license which had been, as several of the Respondents knew, granted to the deputies of the Monthly Meeting, to adduce fresh charges against me however irrelevant, throughout the whole of the proceedings.

The Clerk informed me, that on inquiry it appeared that only six or seven of the members of the Committee had read the pamphlet of which I complained in my appeal, from whence he concluded it had not been so widely circulated as I apprehended. I replied, it is not in my power to say how far the minute of the Meeting for Sufferings, and the recommendation it contained had been complied with, but I happened to know that the pamphlet in question had found its way into various and distant parts of the kingdom, and had actually produced such effects on the minds of some friends as I had spoken of in my appeal.

The Committee intimating their adherence to the minute, I hesitated whether to claim any farther hearing or not; but at length concluded to proceed, not as I hinted, with any expectation of obtaining justice at the hands of men, who could refuse an accused person so equitable a demand, but because I would not afford any pretext for denying me the right of a hearing by the Yearly Meeting, provided I should think proper to claim that privilege.

At this sitting, I read my written defence to the conclusion of the observations on the conduct of the Monthly Meeting's deputies in the Quarterly Meeting. Some time before eight, the Committee adjourned to nine the next morning.

Committee of Appeals, Devonshire House, 2d Sitting 5th Month 20th, 1814.

The Committee met at the time appointed. When I was called upon to proceed, I expressed my regret that the decision of the Committee yesterday, would occasion me to occupy much more of their time than I should otherwise have thought necessary. They had refused to hear my just complaints of the manner in which I had been treated by the constituted authorities of the Society, while I was an appellant to the Yearly Meeting. I therefore felt myself called upon to shew more minutely that a similar unconstitutional influence had been exerted against me, by the agency of the Overseers and Committee of the Monthly Meeting, who were in reality the mere tools of a secret junta, whose names they refused to disclose, but by whose instigation it is evident they acted. My proofs of this and of the futility of their accusations were principally deduced from my *MS.* minutes, the substance of which is given in my Narrative, pp. 1 to 25, 56 to 105, and 149 to 178.

I afterwards read the remainder of my written defence. The Committee adjourned about two o'clock to four the same afternoon.

Committee of Appeals, Gracechurch Street, 3d Sitting 5th Month 20th, 1814.

At this sitting the Respondents went through their reply, which occupied about three hours and a half, during which time I made minutes. From these I might exhibit the substance of their argument, but as it was in my apprehension neither consistent nor scriptural, I shall omit any statement of it here, in the hope they will lay it before the public more fully and correctly than is in my power. The restraint under which they stated the members of the

Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex felt themselves, not to publish any reply to the pamphlet entitled a Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism, &c. or to the Narrative of the proceedings in my case, while the same was pending, has now been long removed. This was complained of by them as a grievance of no small magnitude. Either this complaint was unfounded and ought not to have been preferred in such general terms *only*, or the parties making it ought to have long since evinced their sense of the injury of which they complained, by availing themselves of the removal of those pretexts on which it rested. This they have not yet done; I was surprised at such an empty parade of delicacy, when I recollected that I had been in effect held up by the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders, and by the Meeting for Sufferings, to the whole Society as "a professed disciple of Mahomet," and was yet as they knew, and even at their instance deprived of any opportunity before my judges of repelling such an accusation.

When the Respondents had concluded their reply, my father-in-law, Thomas Compton, who had at my request accompanied me, expressed a wish that the Committee would consider the propriety of adjourning, as they had already sat so many hours, and he thought must be aware the Appellant was too much exhausted to render it proper to call upon him to proceed farther that evening. The Respondents without waiting to hear the sentiments of the Committee on this proposal, objected to it, saying, if it was granted, they should claim a similar privilege, which would occasion another adjournment! The Committee were of opinion, that the present was the proper time, if I inclined to make any observations on the reply of the Respondents. My rejoinder took about an hour, when I concluded, the Clerk of the Committee drew up a paper, which he proposed the Appellant and the Respondents should sign,

acknowledging that they had been fairly and fully heard.

I objected to signing any such paper unless it stated as an exception the point whereon I had claimed a right of being heard, which they refused. The Committee declined stating this circumstance, and therefore no paper was signed. The Respondents and myself were desired to attend at the same place to-morrow evening, at half after six, to give the Committee any explanation they might call for. Before the time appointed we received notice that our attendance was not required. We were afterwards desired to attend the Committee on the 23d at nine in the morning, when, after waiting some time, we were informed the Committee had no occasion for our attendance.

Soon after the Yearly Meeting met, we received notice that the Committee of Appeals intended to present their report to the sitting in the afternoon.

Yearly Meeting, 5th Month 23d, 1814.

About half past four the Respondents, my father-in-law, and myself were introduced to seats near the table. The Clerk inquired whether the parties had been fairly and fully heard by the Committee? I replied, I have, with one exception relative to a subject noticed in my appeal, on which the Committee at the suggestion of the Respondents refused to hear me, on such grounds as could not possibly apply to my claim to be heard on that point by the meeting, if in my estimation it should be necessary. One of the Committee proposed informing the meeting why they refused hearing me upon that point. I requested they would either state my claim and their objection, or let the former be done by reading the last article in my appeal. It was read accordingly by the Clerk, the conclusion excepted. The Respondents objected

to my being heard at all on that subject, saying it was irrelevant matter not relating to the decision of the Quarterly Meeting which they were appointed to defend, and against which the appeal was presented.

I urged the reasonableness of allowing any accused person to endeavour to remove whatever prejudices might be supposed to have influenced the minds of those who were to be his judges. No accused person was ever denied this privilege in our courts of justice, and in some cases trials were removed or put off in order to insure an impartial, unbiassed jury. I only required a short time to say all that I should deem necessary on this subject, perhaps less than had been already taken up with the discussion, whether I was to be allowed this privilege or not.

One of the Committee alleged that the Appellant wished to be heard in reply to a pamphlet which had been published, with the approbation of the Morning Meeting, since the decision against which he appealed.

I replied, this statement confirms my previous persuasion, that the conclusion of the Committee rested on mistaken grounds. I never intended to enter into an examination of this pamphlet, but only of such parts of it as had a direct tendency to excite unfounded prejudices against me in the minds of my judges.

Joseph John Gurney said, that on inquiring of the twenty-seven members of the Committee individually, it appeared that only six or seven had read or seen the pamphlet; and he alleged that the Committee were not at all influenced by it, and considered it quite irrelevant matter.

A number of Friends objecting to my claim, in preferring which, I was *mistakenly* said to have nonsuited myself. For I only claimed a hearing, and not the judgment of the court. However, I concluded to wave it, as no attempt was made to justify the work.

The following report was then read by the Clerk.

To the Yearly Meeting,

We, your Committee appointed to hear and judge of the Appeal of Thomas Foster, against the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, having paid deliberate attention to the case as laid before us in the respective statements of the Appellant and Respondents, report, that we are unanimously of the judgment that the decision of the said Quarterly Meeting, on the appeal of the said Thomas Foster, against the Monthly Meeting of Ratcliff, should be confirmed.

"Signed at the Back Chamber, Gracechurch Street, 5th Month 23d, 1814, by all the Committee."

After this report had been *twice read*, and a minute thereon made and read, I rose to request the case might "be heard in the Meeting," agreeably to the 6th rule concerning Appeals.

Some objections were now made, particularly by William Tuke and William Alexander, to the case being entered into; the latter alleging that I had deprived myself of the right of being heard, by printing my Appeal.

John Wilkinson, the Clerk, observed, that it must be evident to the Meeting that the Appeal had not been printed. The rule alluded to was now called for and read, viz. "This Meeting agrees not to receive, in future, any Appeal in print, or that hath been printed."

William Tuke said it was intended to prevent the printing of any thing relative to an appeal, while the same was pending. Several other Friends concurred in this opinion. It was however concluded, as the minute related, only to printing an appeal; and the parties had been heard by a Committee who had pre-

sented a report, that the appeal should be read as the preliminary step to the parties being heard by the Meeting.

My right to a hearing, under the existing rules, being thus admitted, some considerations were suggested, in order to induce me to relinquish it. These were in substance, that, as the Meeting had refused to hear me on that subject which induced me to appeal, whether it would not be more consistent with that profession, and more likely to promote my own peace of mind in a dying hour, quietly to submit to the judgment of so large and judicious a Committee, than to persevere in claiming a further hearing?

I informed the Meeting, that although I was not satisfied at present with the judgment of the Committee, it was possible I might be, when I knew "*the grounds of their decision*," as the 7th rule concerning appeals required. (See p. 29.) Should that be the case, I should be truly glad to feel no farther obligation to occupy the time of the Meeting.

The rule being read, the Committee reported that they had appointed Joseph John Gurney, and Joel Lean, "to explain to the Meeting, in the presence of the Appellant and Respondents, the grounds of their decision," and that they were prepared to present the same. It could not be denied, that the rule was absolutely imperative, but the leading Disciplinarians were too wary to permit the Committee to state to the Meeting the grounds of their decision, for then these grounds might have been examined. William Tuke observed, that the rule did not say at what stage of the proceedings this explanation should be given. The Meeting were to judge of that, and not the Appellant or the Respondents. I am of opinion, he added, it is not necessary at present to call upon the Committee to explain the grounds of their decision. This opinion being supported by a number of Friends, it was proposed that the Appeal

should be read. I took the liberty to say, that it appeared to me that common sense, and the evident import of the rule, pointed out that the most proper time for giving the explanation required in the presence of the parties, was before they had been heard by the Meeting, which would be afterwards as competent to judge of the grounds of any decision it might come to, as its Committee.

The Meeting concluded to hear the parties, without requiring any explanation of the grounds of the Committee's decision.* The Appeal was then read by the Clerk,† very audibly and impressively. After which, the minutes of the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings on the case were also read. The farther hearing being deferred till the next sitting, my Father Compton and myself withdrew a little after seven, soon after which the Meeting adjourned.

Yearly Meeting, 5th Month 24th, 1814.

A few minutes before noon, the Respondents and myself had notice, and were introduced to seats near the table. My Father Compton accompanied me. After a short pause, I rose and addressed the Meeting, as follows:

My Christian Brethren,

There are two considerations by which I am

* Till some months after the Yearly Meeting, I did not know whether the persons deputed by the Committee to give this explanation to the Meeting, meant to do it verbally or in writing. I was then informed, it was prepared in writing, submitted to the Committee and approved by them, to be laid before the Yearly Meeting as their united judgment. But as that assembly did not choose it should be read in conformity to its own rule made in 1813, although several of the Committee applied to their Clerk for it, they were refused a copy of their own document. So important was it deemed to keep the *grounds* of this decision in the dark.

† For a copy of which, see pp. 35—47.

powerfully impressed in rising to address you. The first is the high importance of those principles of our common faith, for adhering to, and professing which, I have been called in question, and now stand before you, as a person accused by a large and powerful body. The other is the painful sense I feel of my incompetency to support and defend those principles in such a manner as the occasion requires.

Sensible as I am of this, and of the inadequacy of human reason, unassisted by the discoveries of divine revelation, to have unfolded to mankind in any satisfactory manner, those hopes of a never-ending inheritance in a future state of progressive improvement, which are brought to light by the gospel, I cannot for a moment doubt, but that every essential part of such a revelation is wisely fitted for its designed end; that is, adapted to the capacities of those to whom it is addressed, the bulk of mankind, the great family of the universal Parent.

Simplicity is accordingly found to be one of the most distinguishing characteristics of all divinely revealed truths, as they are recorded by the sacred writers, and especially those which their great Master taught. And therefore when any supposed Christian tenet appears to want this quality, it requires to be examined with the greater attention, from the presumption on the face of it, that it is not of divine origin. But if *mystery*, the peculiar characteristic of false doctrines—the commandments of men, is inscribed upon it, not in faint, but in strong characters, and avowed to be its chief recommendation, we are doubly called upon to beware of receiving, for a divine truth, the comments or inventions of fallible men.

Of the scriptural simplicity and soundness of those principles which I am now called upon to vindicate in my own defence, I am unshakenly and increasingly satisfied. But I am more and more doubtful how far I may be enabled to do tolerable justice to

so good, so glorious a cause. The contest is such a one, as I never encountered. Yet, with the New Testament in my hand, and relying upon its testimony, I am not dismayed either at the number, or the known talents of some of my opponents.

No less than six Respondents are selected out of the largest Quarterly Meeting in the kingdom, with whom I shall have to discuss the points at issue between us. And how many of the still unknown prompters of the accusation may be among those who will act as my judges, I have no means of ascertaining. Their names have been hitherto concealed from me, in open violation of as express and positive a rule of the Society as any the Book of Extracts contains.*

If, therefore, I should fail in so arduous, so unpromising a contest, I shall have the consolation of reflecting that the weight of influence arrayed against me has been such, that my failure cannot of itself form any just presumption of weakness in the cause in which I am engaged, but only of incompetence in the advocate. If it should so happen, it may be for the best. It will not be the first time that truth has been outvoted. The doctrines of Jesus of Nazareth were equally true, and equally important, when "all the disciples forsook him and fled," as

* Here I proposed for the Clerk to read this rule, that the Meeting might see I had rightly described it. Some objection was now made by Luke Howard, to the Clerk being called upon by the Apellant to assist him in stating his case. I replied, I have no objection to reading the rule myself, but I thought it most proper to be done by the Clerk. It was then read, and is as follows: "Whereas, it may happen that some Friends may suffer much in their reputation and character by a detracting spirit, *which too much prevails among some bearing our name;* who shelter themselves under a pretence, that they say no more than they have heard from others, *but will not discover who they are;* wherefore, to prevent this evil of reporting and tale bearing, it is agreed, that such reporters or tale-bearers *shall either discover their authors*, or be *dealt* with and testified against as the authors thereof." 1744.

when a short time before the multitudes cried "Hosanna to the son of David: blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

I am chiefly desirous to bear my testimony to the truth faithfully and plainly, as it appears to me by the united voice of reason and Scripture. Respecting the result, I am not anxious, knowing it is in better hands than mine or your's. The task which has, by an unsought-for train of circumstances, devolved on me, is comparatively easy; and, with my convictions, it would have been mean indeed to have shrunk from the trial. I cannot forget that it was in the same cause that William Penn suffered imprisonment in the Tower of London, for publishing the Sandy Foundation Shaken, a work repeatedly sanctioned by the Society;* nor that long before that time the intrepid Servetus was burnt at Geneva, at the instigation of the unrelenting Calvin. Many years after, when the true principles of the Reformation ought to have been better understood, the same punishment was inflicted in this city, on Bartholomew Legatt, who was, Fuller the historian tells us,

* This Tract was first printed in 1668. About five years after, its Author published a reply to John Faldo, in which he says, T. F. that is, Thomas Firmin, would have the Apology for it, entitled, "Innocency with her open Face," to be "*a retraction*," which Penn positively denies. See his Works, vol. ii. p. 453. This edition of Penn's Works was published by the Society, about eight years after the Author's decease, viz. in 1726. In the Table of Contents, opposite the *full title* of the Sandy Foundation Shaken, the following advertisement is *conspicuously* printed in the margin: —"Note. *A learned Defence* of this Treatise is in the posthumous works of Richard Claridge, sold by the printer hereof." In the year 1771, the Sandy Foundation was again published by the Society, in Penn's SELECT WORKS, in 1 vol. folio; and again in 1782, in 5 vols. 8vo. Such is the manner in which this work has been *publicly* and *pointedly* distinguished by the Society. At length, however, a profession of the scriptural doctrines it contains, incurs censure and disownment! Has the Society changed its principles, or is it become less tolerant than formerly? Perhaps both.

"excellently skilled in Scripture, and his conversation unblameable."*

The warrant for his execution, under the hand of James I. was addressed to the Sheriffs of London, in 1611, as the instrument testifies, "with the advice and consent, as well of the Reverend Bishops and other Divines, as also of men learned in the law, in judgment sitting and assisting."†

* In the commission addressed by "James, King of England, &c. defender of the faith, &c. to our right trusty and right well-beloved Counsellor, Thomas Lord Ellesmere, our Chancellor of England," the errors of the said Bartholomew Legatt, who was prosecuted at the suit of John King, then Bishop of London, are said to consist "chiefly in these thirteen blasphemous positions following, viz. That the creed called the *Nicene Creed* and *Athanasius's Creed*, contain not a profession of the true Christian faith, or that he will not profess his faith according to the same creeds. That Christ is not God of God begotten, not made, but begotten and made. That there are no persons in the Godhead. That Christ was not God from everlasting, but began to be God, when he took flesh of the Virgin *Mary*. That the world was not made by Christ. That the Apostles teach Christ to be man only. That there is no generation in God, but of creatures. That this assertion, God to be made man, is contrary to the rule of faith, and monstrous blasphemy. That Christ was not before the fulness of time except by promise. That Christ was not God otherwise then anointed God. That Christ was not in the form of God equal with God, that is, in substance of God, but in righteousness and giving salvation. That Christ by his Godhead wrought no miracle. That Christ is not to be prayed unto."

† That the reader may more fully see the true character of that union of Church and State, which existed in this country at the time when the present authorized version of the Scriptures was translating, under the influence of their united prejudices, I subjoin a copy of the following document, which exhibits a fair sample of the natural fruits of such an alliance.

"The King to the Sheriffs of London, greeting: Whereas the Reverend Father in Christ John Bishop of London, hath signified unto us, that when he in a certain business of heretical pravity against one Bartholomew Legatt our subject of the City of London, of the said Bishop of London's diocess and jurisdiction, rightly and lawfully proceeding by acts enacted, drawn, proposed, and by the confessions of the said Bartholomew Legatt, before the said Bishop judicially made and acknowledged, hath found in the said Bartholomew Legatt very many wicked errors, false opinions, heresies, and cursed blasphemies, and impious doc-

Their victim, it is said, "continued firm in his opinions, and his death was not so well taken by the people, as to induce the King to let the Bishops make any more such examples." "He preferred," says Fuller, "that Heretics hereafter, though condemned, should silently and privately waste themselves away in prison, rather than to amuse others with the solemnity of a public execution."

Such was the persecuting spirit of that King, and of the ecclesiastics and learned men in whom he trusted, at the very time when the present authorized translation of the Scriptures was preparing under

trines, expressly contrary and repugnant to the Catholic faith and religion, and the holy word of God, knowingly and maliciously, and with a pertinacious and obdurate, plainly incorrigible mind, to believe, hold, affirm and publish, the same Revered Father the Bishop of London with the advice and consent, as well of the Reverend Bishops and other Divines, as also of men learned in the law, in judgment sitting and assisting; the same Bartholomew Legatt by his definitive sentence hath pronounced, decreed, and declared to be an obdurate, contumacious and incorrigible heretic, and upon that occasion as a stubborn heretic, and rotten, contagious member to be cut off from the church of Christ, and the communion of the faithful; whereas the holy Mother Church hath not further to do and prosecute in this part, the same Reverend Father hath left the aforesaid Bartholomew Legatt as a blasphemous heretic to our secular power to be punished with condign punishment, as by the letters patents of the said Reverend Father in Christ the Bishop of London in this behalf, above made hath certified unto us in our Chancery. We therefore as a zealot of justice, and a defender of the Catholic faith, and willing to maintain and defend the holy church, and rights and liberties of the same, and the Catholic faith: and such heresies and errors every where what in us lieth, to root out and extirpate, and to punish with condign punishment such heretics so convicted, and deeming that such an heretic in form aforesaid, convicted and condemned according to the laws and customs of this our kingdom of England in this part accustomed, ought to be burned with fire; we do command you, that the said Bartholomew Legatt, being in your custody, you do commit publicly to the fire, before the people, in a public and open place in West Smithfield, for the cause aforesaid, and that you cause the said Bartholomew Legatt to be really burned in the same fire, in detestation of the said crime, for the manifest example of other Christians, lest they slide into the same fault, and this that in no wise you omit, under the peril that shall follow thereon. Witness, &c."

his auspices and his influence, by persons selected by him.* At the time of Legatt's martyrdom, the work had been several years in hand, and was published in 1611: some copies have the dates of 1612, and others of 1613. In the lapse of two centuries, and with the advantages of a much more correct Greek text, than King James's translators are known to have had, it is no wonder that learned men have discovered some marks of a bias in the received version towards the opinions of the translators, and those of their royal master,† and some which they

* The following persons were chosen to translate the Gospels, the Acts, and the Revelations. Dr. Ravis, Dean of Christ Church, afterwards Bishop of London; Dr. Abbott, Master of University College, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury; Dr. Eedes, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Savill, Dr. Peryn, Dr. Ravens, and Mr. Harmer. And to translate St. Paul's and the other canonical Epistles, Dr. Barlowe, of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, Dean of Chester, afterward Bishop of London; Dr. Hutchenson, Dr. Spencer, Mr. Fenton, Mr. Rabbett, Mr. Sanderson, and Mr. Dakins.

Is it possible to conceive that these men, or "the most ancient and grave divines" selected by the same royal authority, to whose revision their labours were subjected as "*Overseers of the Translations*," were not infected with the general persecuting spirit of the age, and at least approving, if not consenting to the execution of Legatt? There seems, indeed, to have been "*much unanimity*" among "the Bishops, other Divines and men learned in the law," on this occasion.

† Some of the King's rules "for the better ordering of their proceedings," which he recommended "to be *most carefully observed*," had a strong tendency to produce or to strengthen such a bias.

The 1st directs "The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called the Bishop's Bible, *to be followed*, and as little altered as the original *will permit*."

2d. "The names of the Prophets and the holy writers, with the other names in the text, to be retained, *as near as may be*, accordingly as they are *vulgarly used*."

3d. "The *old* ecclesiastical words *to be kept*, viz. as the word *(Church)* not to be translated *congregation, &c.*" How far the licence granted under this most important "*&c.*" was intended to extend, is not easy to determine. The 4th rule directs, that "When any word hath diverse significations, *that* to *be kept*, which hath been *most commonly* used by *the most eminent Fathers*, being agreeable to the propriety of the place, and *the analogy of faith*." The

had not the means of correcting. The surprise is when these circumstances are considered, that the errors which have been detected are not more numerous and more important.

I have however been loudly censured for holding that the received version contained any errors. I have been told that such objections tended to bring the whole into discredit. You will, I trust, judge otherwise. Our predecessors in the faith were not afraid to admit that the received text contained corrupted and perverted passages, and they bore this testimony at a time when persecution was still in fashion, although its royal patrons had discovered that the people no longer relished such savage entertainments, as the burning of reputed Heretics.

Our ancestors found, however, by experience, that the same spirit was living, and subjected them to long and grievous imprisonments. But at length happier times have arrived; and since you met last year within these walls, I can congratulate you most sincerely, that both you and I may now, under the protecting arm of the law, openly profess our respective sentiments concerning the proper object of worship, without any man daring to make us afraid, and without depending, as before, for security from

received faith of course must be meant here.—See Dr. Adam Clarke's "General preface" to his Edit. of the "authorized Translation," in which Fuller's high eulogium of these "worthy men, now all removed to their fathers and gone to God," and "of that gracious KING that employed them," is quoted with evident approbation.

But Fuller's equally express testimony to the King's zeal *in burning reputed heretics* is kept entirely out of sight, and that of his Bishops and other Divines, which not being so well relished by the people as heretofore, the King was at length induced to gratify their persecuting spirit and his own, in a less public manner, viz. by imprisonment for life. Yet Dr. Adam Clarke pronounces, that the work of these translators, (who it is to be hoped, knew not what spirit they were of)—"The English Translation of the Bible, made under *the direction* of King James the First, is the most accurate and faithful of the whole." He adds, "*Nor is this its only praise*; the Translators have seized the very *spirit* and *soul* of the original!"

injury, not on the energy of the law, but on the growing liberality of the times.

The reading of my Appeal will, I trust, have conveyed a clear, general view of my objections to the proceedings against me. I was induced to include more in it than I should have thought necessary, had not certain hints been publicly thrown out by some Disciplinarians, whose opinions are known to have much influence over others, and especially by one of the Respondents, that it was very doubtful whether you would permit the Appeal to be heard.

In such an event, carefully as I had endeavoured to avoid any breach of the rules concerning Appeals, and to conform to the regulations they enjoined, I was desirous my Appeal should contain as plain and full a summary of the leading facts of the case, as I could comprize within the limits of such a document. By having so done, however, I hope to shorten and simplify, rather than prolong and perplex the discussion, as I expect to have less to say on the several heads of it, the last excepted, until the Respondents have replied to them, as I trust they will separately and distinctly. I shall also look to them for some appropriate notice of my written defence, before the Quarterly Meeting, which will always speak the same language. A copy of it has, I have reason to believe, been long since in their hands, and consequently open to their examination.*

It was first read in their hearing, and I may with confidence appeal to them, whether any reply to it was made, or attempted, either by the Monthly

* One of the Respondents here observed, that they were not aware of having been ever put into possession of a copy of this document. I replied, not in *MS.* but as it is recorded in my Narrative which I happened to know had been in some of their hands as long ago as the last Yearly Meeting, and I supposed they did not mean to say or to insinuate that my address was not given in that work as it was delivered. The Respondent replied, we do not question that, but thought the expressions used referred to a copy put into our hands by the Appellant.

Meeting's Respondents, or by any member of the Quarterly Meeting, the next day, when the subject should have been discussed. They will also, I conclude, recollect that when little more than half my Address to the Meeting had been read, that Joseph Gurney Bevan remarked, "that the part they had already heard would take many hours to examine properly."

This observation of so competent a judge, was made in their presence and mine; while the impression of my Address to the Meeting was fresh in his recollection. After such an admission, which no person present offered to controvert, on what rational principle the Meeting could come to a conclusion without any previous examination of that Address, or any thing in it, is difficult to imagine. The Respondents will perhaps be able to throw some light on the hitherto unexplained grounds of the Meeting's judgment. It behoves them to do so, in order that any benefits that decision is thought likely to produce may be known, and the principles on which it is founded be understood.

Unable to ascertain either of these points, or to obtain any authentic and satisfactory information concerning them, I at length gave due notice of appeal to you. Soon after which, I much doubted the expediency of prosecuting it; not because those principles, for openly avowing which I had been accused and disowned, appeared to me less important or less sound and scriptural than before, but because I feared appealing unsuccessfully, might for a time at least, strengthen and extend the influence of a precedent which I consider radically unsound, because it goes to sanction the arbitrary imposition of unscriptural articles of faith, and to encourage an inquisitorial, intolerant and Pharisaic spirit, than which nothing is more unfavourable to a manly independent search after truth in the love of it, nor more opposed to that spirit which the gospel of Christ invariably inculcates.

Yet under such impressions as these was I disposed to concede to my accusers, without further contest, the possession of a victory obtained neither by the force of reason nor argument, but by the exercise of lordship or ecclesiastical power, by which a few zealous Disciplinarians are enabled to pronounce in the name and on behalf of a large number of their brethren, whatever they may choose to pass off as the collective sense of a Meeting for Discipline.

I was weary of such a useless and unequal contest, and increasingly satisfied with my intention to relinquish it, till I found that fresh measures were resorted to, I have every reason to believe at the instance of those many friends of other Monthly Meetings with whom these proceedings originated. Clothed indeed in another character, as the bishop was, who is said to have apologized for conduct inconsistent with the character of a Christian bishop, by saying he acted not in the quality of bishop, but of Prince. That system of defamation of which I have complained in the last section of my Appeal, has been widely extended in a manner much more injurious to the reputation of the Society than it can be to mine.*

In my Appeal I have referred to several very important texts of Scripture, which in my apprehension clearly evince the fundamental principles of the London Unitarian Book Society, to be those of Primitive Christianity, and consequently justify me for becoming a subscriber to that society. I would now briefly review them. The first is from the 12th chapter of Mark, in which the insidious but unsuccessful attempts of "certain of the Pharisees, and of the Herodians, to catch him [Jesus] in his words," is most instructively recorded.

* Had I been permitted I should here have read the two letters inserted, pp. 3—15, and 18—21, in order to remove from the minds of my judges the prejudices which had been so industriously excited against me by the Society's most powerful agents.

After which, it is said, "one of the Scribes came and having heard them reasoning together," as the manner of Jesus was, with those who opposed themselves to his doctrines, "and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him,—Which is the first commandment of all?" That is, of the whole ten. In answer to such a question by a Jewish Scribe well versed in their law, any other teacher than our great Lord and Master would probably have replied in the terms of that which is usually called the first commandment. "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me."

But he who had the spirit of wisdom poured out upon him, in a super-eminent degree, or without measure, and therefore "spake as never man spake," chose to use on this occasion, still more definite language, denoting with a strength and energy as great as any terms can convey, *the absolute unity of God*, and the supreme importance of openly asserting that doctrine, and of loving him above all, and our neighbour as ourselves. "And Jesus answered him [the Scribe] the first of all the commandments is, 'Hear O Israel, the Lord our God, is *one* Lord,'" as the received text has it, but still if possible more strongly as it ought to be rendered "Jehovah our God, is *one* Jehovah." Not *three*, nor does the text either here, or elsewhere represent the one Supreme, as "subsisting, in three most glorious persons, in the unity of essence, co-equal and co-eternal." This is language to be found in liturgies, creeds and confessions of faith, but wholly unknown to the sacred writers.

When all the circumstances under which this memorable recognition of the recorded language of Jehovah concerning himself are duly and seriously considered, they appear to me to shew what great importance Jesus Christ annexed to the consistent and unequivocal profession of this grand fundamental truth, which holds up Jehovah not as an object of gloomy superstitious terror, but of love, of reverence

and of gratitude, as the equal and all-benevolent parent of mankind. In short, as a doctrine if suffered to make its proper impression on the mind, which powerfully tends to promote the fulfilment of the whole law, love to God, and love to our neighbour.

The Evangelist, no doubt, well knowing the mind of his great Master, has materially strengthened this evidence, by shewing how it was understood by a person whom he records as being suitably impressed with the superiority of our Lord's reasoning, over that of his adversaries. For he tells us, that the Scribe said unto him, [Jesus] " Well, Master, thou hast said the truth, for there is *one* God, and there is none other but he, and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God."

The next passage of Scripture to which I have referred in my Appeal, is that admirable epitome of Christian doctrine which the Apostle Paul delivered to the Athenians on the following occasion, and which the Evangelist Luke has recorded in the 17th chapter of the Acts, for our instruction and preservation in the primitive Christian faith. " His spirit," says the sacred historian, " was greatly provoked within him when he beheld the city full of idols. He discoursed (the received text says " disputed,") in the synagogue with the Jews, and with those Gentiles who worshiped *God*, and in the market-place daily with such as presented themselves. Then certain philosophers—encountered him. And some said, what will this babbler say? and others, he seemeth to be a setter forth of foreign demons: because he preached to them the glad tidings of Jesus, and of the resurrection. And they took him—to the court of Areopagus, saying, ' May we know what this new

doctrine *is*, of which thou speakest? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we desire therefore to know what these things mean.'" In reply to these inquiries, it appears that Paul standing "in the midst of Mar's-hill," said,

"Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, 'To the unknown God,' whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands: neither is worshiped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life and breath and all things, and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation: that they should seek the Lord, if happily they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from every one of us. For in him we live, and move, and have our being, as certain also of your own poets have said. For we also are his offspring. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the godhead is like unto gold or silver, or stone graven by art or man's device. And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent: because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that Man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

Consistently with this most appropriate and comprehensive exposition of Christian faith, the same apostle addressing the church at Corinth—as believers in the grace of God which is given by Jesus Christ, declares, that "though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or on earth—to us [the primitive believers] there is *but one God* THE

FATHER, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." For it was *given him*, "to be head over all things to the church." Yet as the same apostle assures us, "It is manifest that he [God even *the Father*] is excepted who did put all things under him."

In unison with this truly evangelical doctrine, the apostle writing to Timothy his own son in the faith, testifies that there is *one God*, who in the riches of his mercy—will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth—and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus—who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light by the gospel.

It cannot, I think, be denied that the foregoing texts amply justify as sound and scriptural every proposition contained in the fundamental principles of the London Unitarian Book Society. Surely then, no Christian society can be justified in expelling any of its members for promoting their reception among men.

As I have been held responsible for all that the preface to the book of rules of this Society contains, and much prejudice and misapprehension exists respecting the general principles of those who are usually called Unitarians, and against me, on account of my connexion with this Book Society, give me leave, in the perspicuous language of Robert Aspland, in his Plea for that class of Dissenters, "to occupy your attention for a few minutes longer by stating what is not, and what is "their" faith.*

* On taking up this work, an objection was made to my quoting the passage I intended, as having nothing to do with the question before the meeting. But the Clerk observed, that if the Appellant had transcribed the passage, no Friend could have had any pretence for objecting to his adducing it in his defence, and as this was evidently not done merely to save the trouble of copying, I think he should be allowed to read the passage from the work he has referred to. I then proceeded for some time without farther obstruction.

"We do not believe," says he, in 'all and every thing contained in the Book of Common Prayer:' it has many things which we cannot find in the Bible, and some things which the Bible appears to us to discountenance and forbid; and we hold—'in its full force and extent, the declaration of the sixth article—that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation,—so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.'

"We do not believe in the Athanasian Creed: to our understanding it is contradictory and absurd; we consider it to be subversive of the first principle of revealed religion, the Divine Unity; and we shudder at the solemn and awful defiance of charity and mercy, with which it opens and concludes.

"We do not believe in 'Original or Birth Sin,' consisting as explained in the ninth Article, in the 'corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is ingendered of the offspring of Adam,' and 'in every person born into this world,' deserving 'God's wrath and damnation:' we cannot conceive that there is any sin in being born; we have been instructed by the Apostle John,* that 'sin is the transgression of the law,' and by the Apostle Paul,† 'that where no law is, there is no transgression,' our reverence of the perfections of the Almighty Creator, will not permit us to suppose that he has made any creature naturally corrupt, or that *he hateth any thing which he hath made;* and we have learnt from one apostle‡ that man is made 'after the similitude of God,' from another, § that 'he is the image and glory of God,' and from our Saviour,‖ that children in whom human nature is fresh and

* 1 John iii. 4. † Rom. iv. 15. ‡ James iii. 9.
§ 1 Cor. xi. 7. ‖ Matt. xix. 14.

entire, are so far from deserving, by virtue of nature, 'God's wrath and damnation,' that 'of such is the kingdom of heaven.'

"We do not believe according to the eleventh Article, that 'we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit' of Jesus Christ, and 'that we are justified by faith only:' for we receive the doctrine of Scripture, that 'he that doeth righteousness is righteous,'* that 'God having raised up his Son Jesus sent him to bless,' us 'by turning away every one of' us 'from his iniquities,'† that at 'the judgment-seat of Christ,' we shall receive 'according to the deeds done in the body,'‡ that 'eternal life' is the merciful reward of 'patient continuance in well-doing,'§ that it is only by 'giving all diligence, and adding to our faith' every *virtue*, that we can 'make our calling and election sure,' and that thus alone 'an entrance shall be ministered unto' us 'abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord,'‖ and that, therefore, it is the duty of every man, 'to prove his own work, and then he shall have rejoicing in himself alone and not in another; for every man shall bear his own burden.'¶

"We do not believe that 'works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his spirit,' as the 13th Article asserts, 'are not pleasant to God—but have the nature of sin:' this is the doctrine of an African Saint, Augustin, but we have been taught by higher saints, Peter and Paul, that 'God is no respecter of persons, but that in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him,'** and that the gospel is a revelation of "glory, honour and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile."††

"For these reasons from Scripture, we are obliged

* 1 John iii. 7. † Acts iii. 26. ‡ 2 Cor. v. 10.
§ Rom. ii. 7. ‖ 2 Peter i. 5, 10, 11. ¶ Gal. vi 4, 5.
** Acts x. 34, 35. †† Rom. ii. 10.

also to withhold our assent from the 18th Article, which declares them ' accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature:' this anathema seems to us to lie against the Apostle Paul, who asserts,* that ' the Gentiles not having the law,' sometimes ' do by nature the things contained in the law, being a law unto themselves,' and shew ' the work of the law which is written in their hearts,' and that they who have lived ' without the law shall not be judged by the law;' and even against our Lord and Teacher, who expressly says,† that ' many shall come from the east and the west, and from the north and from the south,' (plainly intending the heathen countries), ' and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.'

" We do not believe, as the 20th Article asserts, that ' the church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith:' such authority without infallibility is ridiculous, such power may uphold every superstition and sanction every ecclesiastical oppression, and both the power and the authority are inconsistent with the ' sufficiency of the holy Scriptures' well maintained in the article before quoted, at war with the right of private judgment, and a usurpation of the prerogative of Jesus Christ, who only has authority and power in the church, who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and who has forbidden in his disciples individually and collectively the assumption and exercise of lordship. ‡

" In these points, we do not believe in, or with the Church of England; but we do not censure, we dare not condemn its members; to their *own master they*, as well as we, stand or fall; § and we rejoice in the

* Rom. ii. 12, 14. † Matt. viii. 11, and Luke xiii. 29.
‡ Luke xxii. 25, 26. Matt. xxiii. 9, 10. § Mark xii. 29.

persuasion that their belief and our disbelief may be equally acceptable to heaven, if equally conceived in conscientious inquiry, and equally professed in charity.

"But having acknowledged and explained our want of faith, let me briefly state what is the faith which we actually hold, and I must be forgiven for making the statement in the language of Scripture, because I can find no other language which would so fully, and yet so concisely, express my meaning.*

"We believe, then, that 'the Lord our God is one Lord,' and that the profession and observance of this great truth is, 'the first of all the commandments.'†

"We believe, that 'the hour is come, when the true worshipers should worship the Father.'‡

"We believe, that as 'there is one God, the Father,'§ so 'there is one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all men, to be testified in due time.'‖

"We believe in 'Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God by miracles, and wonders, and signs which God did by him.'¶

"We believe, that 'since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead, for as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive;'** that God 'now commandeth all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by

* William Tuke observed, that all this was extraneous matter and had nothing to do with the case before the meeting, and he thought the Clerk should interpose and prevent the Appellant from going on. He ought, indeed, to have been stopped long ago. I replied, I have adduced nothing but what appears to me pertinent to the occasion, indeed much more so, than a great part of what the Respondents were allowed to adduce against me before the Committee of Appeals. However, as I have but very little more to add on this subject, it will take much less time to permit me to go on, than to discuss whether I am strictly in order or not.

The Clerk desir d me to proceed.---

† Mark xii. 29. ‡ John iv. 23. § 1 Cor. viii. 6.
‖ 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. ¶ Acts ii. 22. ** 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.

that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead;* that 'the Father hath given the Son authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man;'† that at Christ's coming, is 'the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father—then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.'"‡

When I had proceeded thus far, the Meeting adjourned about one to four the same afternoon.

Yearly Meeting, 5th Month 24th, 1814.

Afternoon Sitting.

Being called upon by the Clerk to proceed with my defence, I rose and addressed the Meeting as follows:—

The Monthly Meeting's Committee confessed they did not know, and refused to inform themselves what the contents of any of the works were which the London Unitarian Book Society circulated, but rested their objections to my being a subscriber, until their last visit, wholly on the contents of the preface to its book of rules.

The first paragraph asserts, that "Christianity proceeding from God, must be of infinite importance;" and that "a more essential service cannot be rendered to mankind than to advance the interests of truth and virtue, to promote peace, liberty and good order in society; to accelerate the improvement of the species—to exalt the character and secure the ultimate happiness of individuals, by disseminating right principles of religion, and by exciting the attention of men to the genuine doctrines of Revelation." What is it this paragraph affirms?

* Acts xvii. 30, 31. † John v. 27. ‡ Cor. xv. 24. 28.

The divine origin of Christianity, and its supreme importance to the present and future happiness of man. No Christian can surely object to this.

But how does this Book Society propose to forward these desirable ends? Its primary and "*chief object*" in the distribution of all its books, is professedly to excite the attention of men to the Scriptures, as the sole authentic record of the "*genuine doctrines of Revelation.*" To these writings they refer as the proper touchstone of all doctrines, whether they are of divine authority or of human invention. The Society claims no infallibility in favour of any other writings, and the declared intent of distributing them is principally to induce men to search the Scriptures for themselves, and to try all doctrines by their testimony.

All other works are supposed by this Society to be more or less tinctured with error, and therefore with becoming modesty and reverence for the sacred writings, they propose "promoting Christian knowledge and the practice of virtue, *chiefly* by exciting the attention of men to the genuine doctrines of Revelation," as *therein unfolded;* and secondarily, "by distributing such books as appear to the members of the Society to contain the most rational views of the gospel, and to be most free from the errors, by which it has long been sullied and obscured." And so far as I have, during a period of more than ten years, become acquainted with the works this Society circulates, their manifest and general tenor and tendency are, to hold up the Scriptures as being of *paramount authority* in all that concerns faith and worship. Such also I have abundant reason to believe, are the serious and conscientious views of its subscribers generally, so far as my acquaintance with them enables me to judge.

"Error, voluntary or involuntary," says the writer of this preface, "so far as it extends, must have a pernicious influence. The members of this Society

think, therefore, that they are doing signal service to the cause of truth and good morals, by endeavouring to clear the Christian system from all *foreign* incumbrances, and by representing the doctrines of Revelation in their *primitive simplicity*." That is, in scriptural language, the language of Christ and his apostles. "Truth must ultimately be favourable to virtue."

The next paragraph contains the fundamental principles of the Society, which my accusers professed to approve. On reading that which follows sentence by sentence to them, that I might clearly understand what their objections to this preface were, I found reason to conclude they were nearly, if not wholly confined to the application of the term "*creature*" to Jesus Christ, the most distinguished of the prophets; and therefore asked them whether Christ was not called in Col. i. 15, "the first-born of every creature," or of the whole creation? This they granted, but said they thought the application of this apostolic language to Christ "disrespectful to his character." It seemed otherwise to me. Judge ye of this.

I will not venture, however, to justify all that this preface contains. There are some expressions in it, which are of dubious, perhaps of exceptionable import, and such as I could wish were omitted. But I never thought myself as a subscriber to this Book Society, accountable for these, but for its fundamental principles only.

The other accusation against me is, that I aided in circulating certain Remarks "which found fault with the Yearly Meeting Epistle for 1810." They did so, amidst much commendation of its general tenor and tendency, for the following reasons:—

1st. That it holds up the object of prayer, as being one "*upon whom help is laid*," that is, one who received, and therefore needed help from another; which by the uniform testimony of Scripture cannot

be predicated of the proper object of prayer, the one only true God, who is the inexhaustible source of all power, perfection and benevolence, the giver of every good and perfect gift.

2d. This Epistle quotes an important text of Scripture incorrectly, and then founds thereon an injunction to apply to Christ in secret supplication, instead of to his Father and our Father, his God and our God, to whom only did Christ direct his disciples to offer their supplications.

3d. It insinuates, that the natural talents with which mankind are endowed, were bestowed on them by Christ, whereas in Scripture these are always represented as the immediate gift of God, even the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

4th. It describes "the lowly-minded Saviour" as "*omnipotent*," who himself assured us, if the testimony of his Evangelists may be credited, "that *of himself* he could do nothing," that all the powers he exercised or possessed were "*given him of his Father.*"

These passages in the Epistle still appear to me inconsistent with the testimony of Christ and his Apostles, as also with the general tenor of all your former annual addresses to the Church. And I wished by sober, dispassionate discussion to bring them to the test of Scripture, that it might appear whether their foundations were laid in the sand, or on the immoveable rock of genuine Revelation.

An Elder in the Society, whose style is well known, accepted this invitation under the signature of "Breviloquus." This writer defined "omnipotence" to be, not an incommunicable attribute of the one Supreme, as I consider it, but as something which might be "*given*" by one being and *received* by another.

Although my accusers charged me "with holding that Jesus Christ is not omnipotent, nor the proper object of worship," they refused to explain whether

they considered omnipotence as a communicable attribute, or, as an essential, inseperable attribute of the Most High God: or whether they ascribed omnipotence to the Man Christ Jesus, or held him to be "the proper object of *supreme religious worship.*"

Yet the Committee at their first visit, distinctly admitted that when they spoke of the divinity of Christ as a doctrine of the Society, they never ascribed it *to the Man Christ Jesus*, but to that divine power which dwelt in and acted by him; but on finding we were likely to agree upon this point, they began to hesitate, and proposed to give me their more deliberate judgment concerning it, at their next visit. But from this time they most disingenuously concealed their own opinions while they were questioning me concerning mine, "on various important points of doctrine."

I would now say a few words on another subject, that I may the sooner remove an erroneous impression which was made on many Friends in the Quarterly Meeting, by the Respondents' adducing an Extract out of a work of mine, as opposing the doctrine of divine influence, and by the unfounded observations which were made thereon in my absence. I have briefly noticed them in my Appeal, but they seem to require some farther explanation.

The first time my accusers even mentioned this doctrine to me, was at the 4th sitting of the Quarterly Meeting's Committee on my Appeal, before whom, I not only evinced this charge to be irrelevant and unfounded, but that the fair construction of the whole passage is directly opposed to that which the Respondents gave of its import. It was quoted by me from a discourse of Dr. Priestley's, "on the doctrine of divine influence on the human mind," for the purpose mentioned in my Appeal; and holds up an attention to the universal presence and constant agency of God, as "of the greatest importance:"—that it is exerted "by natural means, or in a regu-

lar manner;"—that we should "endeavour to see God in every thing, and to see every thing in God, that is, in its relation to him;"—that we ought "habitually to look beyond all second causes, considering them in no other light than as instruments in the hands of God, the only proper cause of all, and employed by him to accomplish in the best manner, his excellent purposes. But in the second place, it is almost of as much importance, that we consider God, not as a being incapable of foresight, but as foreseeing every thing that can ever come to pass—as acting by general laws, without ever deviating from them except for great and extraordinary purposes, and then in such a manner, as that his interposition shall be publicly known and acknowledged, so as to have the proper effect of miracles.

"Not to respect the general presence and agency of God is practical Atheism; it is living without God in the world; and to expect his miraculous interpositions, and not to consider him as acting by general laws, is to encourage an enthusiasm and a delusion almost as dangerous, leading men to neglect the natural and only efficacious means of improving their characters, and to depend on certain supernatural impulses and feelings of vague and uncertain description, and that cannot have any relation to moral virtue, which consists in a supreme reverence and love of God, an entire devotedness to his will in doing and suffering, a disinterested love of his creatures and our brethren, and a just self-government equally favourable to both.

"On the whole, the doctrine of *divine agency* and *divine influence* respecting things spiritual as well as temporal, *is true*, and in the highest degree important. Our characters approach to perfection, in proportion as we keep it in view, and they are debased and bad in proportion as we lose sight of it."

With this passage before their eyes did the Respondents give no intimation of its import, nor of the

declared purpose for which I made the quotation, but passing these over in silence, most uncandidly adduced the next sentence by itself before the Quarterly Meeting, obviously calculated as it is, when thus severed from its context to make an erroneous impression. The sentence thus selected by them, is as follows:—"But the doctrine of a proper supernatural influence on the mind is false; and though, like most other false principles, it may be very innocent not in fact superseding the use of the natural means of religion, it is always delusive, and in some cases highly dangerous."*

The Respondents did not venture to quote more than this one sentence, nor can even that be bent to their purpose, without putting a forced construction on the word *supernatural*, which as there used means *miraculous*, as is evident from the context, and its usual import. The author adds,

"Let this doctrine therefore teach us as individuals to cultivate a spirit of habitual devotion, founded on the belief of *the divine presence with us*, and of his constant agency upon us, and upon all things. This is that faith which is the sure anchor of the soul, in a tempestuous world, or rather it is the wings on which we rise above the world, and approach to a state of *union with God*."

* In my Narrative, pp. 205, 206, I mentioned in a note upon this passage, one fatal instance of the danger of such delusion. Another case equally shocking has occurred since that event, that of an approved minister travelling under certificates from the Society here, of unity and concurrence with his religious labours, in a visit to America. How many minor instances of self-deception are daily happening, it is impossible to ascertain. But I am from long observation so strongly impressed, not only with this delusion occasionally producing suicide, but in its more ordinary operation a variety of lesser evils of no small importance, that I would earnestly recommend to the Quakers generally, as well deserving their attention, Locke's excellent chapter on Enthusiasm, in his Essay on the Human Understanding. I have often thought that chapter as apposite, as if written for their particular benefit. See the Appendix.

Such is the immediate context of that passage by which the Respondents contrived to impress the Quarterly Meeting, that I rejected the doctrine of divine influence on the human mind, or what is usually called the fundamental doctrine of the Society. I presume it cannot be needful to say more to satisfy you, that this accusation is both irrelevant and groundless.*

So undeniably sound and scriptural is the doctrine that there is *but one God*, and that *the Father* is that *one God*, that it has been universally held by Christians of every age, wherever the religion of Jesus of Nazareth has been received. These are truths so clearly revealed in the Scriptures, that there has never been any doubt respecting them, with any persons who acknowledged the authority of those writings. But nothing like this can be said with truth concerning the supposed *Deity* of Christ, or his being the second person in the Trinity: nor concerning the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit, the supposed third person in the Trinity.

All the opinions on these points which have been held by professed Trinitarians, appear to be mere inferences and deductions from certain passages of Scripture, and not that which is expressly affirmed or plainly taught by the sacred writers, and especially when due regard is paid to the context and the general drift of the passage, or of the book or Epistle where it occurs. In fact, the popular or reputedly orthodox opinions on those subjects, never were to my knowledge, and I believe never can be expressed in scriptural language.

Let any person carefully examine the Liturgy of the Church of England, or any other Trinitarian

* The Respondents, several of whom were members of the Quarterly Meeting's Committee, on my appealing to them before your Committee of Appeals, candidly admitted that the above Extract was adduced in the manner above stated.

church, and he will find even there very strong presumptive evidence, that its compilers considered it to be most accordant to the sense of Scripture to address prayer and supreme religious worship to God the Father, *in* or *through* Jesus Christ, that is, as his disciples. For there are comparatively very few prayers in the whole church service addressed to the second, or the third person in the Trinity, or to the three jointly.* There are some few examples of direct religious addresses to each, but generally the *Father only* is addressed agreeably to apostolic precept and example.

The celebrated Dr. Samuel Clarke, it is well known, proposed to render the Liturgy of the Established Church more uniform and consistent, by omitting or altering every part of the service in which prayer, or supreme adoration was addressed to any other object than to God the Father. The Liturgy so reformed, has been long used by some congregations of Dissenters, who in common with the great bulk of professing Christians, consider the injunction of Christ "after this manner, therefore pray ye, Our Father who art in heaven," &c. as authorizing the use of forms of prayer which comprise no peti-

* The Respondents objected to this as irrelevant matter, observing that the charges against the Appellant did not relate to the doctrine of the Trinity. I told the Committee, that I believed if they permitted me to proceed, they would soon see those preliminary observations were relevant to the case. I was then allowed to go on. Before I close this note, I would observe, that at a time when all other places of worship in this country, those of the Quakers excepted, were professedly Trinitarian; the celebrated Elwall, who was tried at Stafford assizes in 1726, for publishing a book in defence of the Unity of God, generally attended their places of worship, where the devotional language, as to the object of prayer and worship was such as he could accord with, because it was Unitarian. He was, I believe, never a member of the Society, holding the lawfulness of Oaths and defensive War, but generally associated with Friends.

An interesting account of his trial is published, price 1d, and may be had of R. Hunter, bookseller, St. Paul's Church Yard, successor to J. Johnson.

tions improper for dependent beings to prefer, and such as all have need to crave, from the bountiful and benignant Parent of the Universe.

In a "list of Friends' books now on sale, which have been published in the course of the last few years, with the approbation of the Morning Meeting," I find one which appears to me to indicate a very similar view on the part of the author and of that meeting, with that which Dr. Samuel Clarke entertained as to the proper object of prayer. This work is entitled, "Correspondence without Controversy." It was written "with a view to remove prejudice, and to promote a friendly disposition towards each other — between the Church of England and the Society of Dissenters, commonly called Quakers."*

In pursuance of so good a purpose, it was natural rather to magnify than to diminish "the correspondence" or similarity between them in sundry important points of doctrine. With such an object in view, and the Book of Common Prayer, including the three Creeds, the Liturgy, &c. before him, what is the amount of the "Correspondence without Controversy," which this approved author has made out with regard to the proper object of worship?

His work has shewn that this correspondence extends so far as the devotional language of the Liturgy is *scriptural* and *strictly Unitarian*. But in this effort to promote a good understanding between the parties, the author has not recognized *any distinction of per-*

* Luke Howard observed, that if the Appellant should prove that another person was as heretical as himself, it would not prove the doctrine held by him to be that of the Society, but only of that individual, for which the Society was not answerable. If the work has been approved by the Morning Meeting for publication, I object to the propriety of saying the Society have sanctioned it. But I do not know that this work has been so approved.

I replied, if that be not granted, I can easily prove it, as I have a copy of the work with me, and a printed minute of the Meeting for Sufferings, testifying that it has been so approved, which is surely to sanction the work. This was no farther disputed and I proceeded.

sons in the Deity, or any religious addresses to the *second* or the *third* persons in *the Trinity*, or in any other manner acknowledged that doctrine as any proof of similarity of faith, much less of "Correspondence without Controversy." He has nevertheless quoted with apparent approbation, the King's declaration respecting the thirty-nine Articles, enjoining submission to them "in the plain and full meaning thereof, and in the literal and grammatical sense." Extracts from more than twenty Prayers from the Liturgy are given in this approved work, under the heads "Absolution — Christmas day — Innocents' day—the 6th Sunday after the Epiphany—the 9th Sunday after Trinity—the Churching of Women—the Communion," &c. without one word of explanation what these *relics of Popery* mean, or any caution respecting them.

Yet with all this inattention to the titles under which these prayers are arranged, your approved author has evinced so much discrimination and discernment, as to adduce nothing of a Trinitarian complexion. His extracts cannot of themselves suggest such an idea to any reader, and yet one of them is selected from "the Collect for the 1st Sunday in Lent," which is addressed to him *who did* "*fast* forty days and forty nights." That is, to *the Man* Christ Jesus, to whom I readily acknowledge every tribute of love, gratitude and reverence, short of that supreme worship which is due only to his God and our God, ought to be rendered by all that are called by his name.

As to what is termed "the Divinity of Christ," if these unscriptural terms must be used, care should be taken that they are only used in a *scriptural sense*, and that their import and application be clearly defined and understood. But on such a subject, I would say on behalf of myself and others who prefer the simplicity of Scripture language to any other, which the folly or the wisdom of man can devise,

" why are we to be accounted heterodox, because, on *the divinity of Christ* we do not incline to go *further* than the Scripture *leads us.*"

My accusers would not agree to this test. This would not satisfy them, yet is it since that time urged *on your behalf*, by Henry Tuke, an approved minister *among you*, in a letter addressed to the Editors of the Christian Observer, and inserted at his request in that work, vol. xiii. pp. 95—100.* It appears, that he highly esteems and strongly recommends this periodical publication, and yet it is plain that the Editors of that work carry their ideas concerning the Deity of Christ, " *as a divine Person*," farther than he feels warranted in following them. They wished to know " whether, when they [the Quakers] affirm the Divinity of Christ, they mean to speak of him *as a divine Person*, or, *as a quality of the Godhead?*" Nothing can be more easy than to give a plain intelligible answer to this question. To avow the orthodox opinion, four words only are necessary [as a divine person]. To avow the contrary opinion, requires no more than six [as a quality of the Godhead]. Instead of this direct course, Henry Tuke professing to reply concisely to this question, begins by observing, " We can, indeed, say on this, as on every other occasion, that we believe all that the Scriptures have spoken and inculcated."

After this, he tells us how he understands the first

* I forbear enlarging on the contents of this letter, or on the reply to it by the Editors of this work, although I have the number for February last by me, in which they are inserted; but I would observe, that those who have read both attentively, will see, I should think, the necessity of admitting the fallibility of those writers, whose works have been generally held in the highest estimation by the members of the Society. I will only add, that the reply to this letter points out many such passages in those works, as I apprehend no judicious Friend in, or out of this meeting would now undertake to defend. I was previously acquainted with most of those exceptionable passages, but know nothing of the person who wrote these observations on Henry Tuke's letter.

verses of the gospel according to John, but not a word about divine persons in the Godhead or the doctrine of the Trinity, although he has not overlooked the head to the chapter inserted by King James's translators in order to favour that doctrine, but has in fact given their comment as an explanation of the text. Finally, he refers in a note to another work of his, first published in 1801, and at last concludes the subject in the following page, by asserting in effect the propriety of not going "further than the Scripture leads us;" and pointing out how unreasonable it is to cast the imputation of heterodoxy on those who limit their profession of faith by the testimony of the sacred writings.

"It need not be concealed," says our Friend George Stacey, pp. 21, 22, of his 'Brief Remarks on the State of Man and his Redemption by Jesus Christ,'* "that there are passages in the sacred writings, which seem to admit of various interpretations, and to give some room for different views concerning doctrine, *more especially in the Epistles.*" In this I perfectly agree, as also that it is equally for the interests of truth and charity that this should be admitted, and the free exercise of the rights of private judgment be on that account, not only respected, but encouraged. Our author adds, "But if the occasions on which these were written, *were well considered*, and what is difficult in them brought to the test of what is *more clear* in other parts of the same apostle's writings, we should be less at a loss respecting *their true meaning.*" That is, to make the apostle his own commentator, and carefully to consider the context, as John Locke has most ably shewn in his Paraphrase on St. Paul's Epistles and the Essay prefixed to it, is the true way to promote a right understanding of those invaluable parts of Scripture.

* This work is included in the "list of Friends' books," mentioned as approved publications, pp. 3, 4.

"And there is one rule in the interpretation of Scripture where it can be applied," adds George Stacey, "which it seems right to observe—*to bring all to the standard of* CHRIST'S OWN DOCTRINE, in subjects on which he has condescended to *explain himself*." This I conclude he has done, with regard to all the genuine and essential doctrines of Christianity, for he was "the *author* and *finisher* of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down on the right hand of the throne of God." We are commanded in matters of faith to acknowledge no other master upon earth.

After laying down the above excellent rule, our author concludes the paragraph, by quoting the words of Christ, recorded in the 7th chapter of John, in the following manner:—"If any man will do [the will of the Father] he shall know of [my] doctrine, whether it be of God." Even in these terms the distinction, which according to the sacred writer, his great Master made, is in some degree preserved, but as it stands in the text, it is much more strongly and emphatically marked. "Now, Jesus went up into the temple and taught, and the Jews marvelled, saying, how knoweth this man letters, having never learned? Jesus answered them, and said, my doctrine *is not mine*, but *His that sent me*. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, *whether it be of God*, or whether I speak *of myself*."—John vii. 14—17.

In p. 15, after speaking in very appropriate terms "of the love of God in Christ, as altogether adapted to the circumstances in which he [man] is placed," our author observes, that "*the* Christian believer—sees exemplified in it, the *mysterious union of the divine and human nature*." By this observation, however, I would hope he does not mean to insinuate, that such as cannot *see this*, are not *Christian believers*. Be this as it may, on the supposition of his seeing

this, our author reasons thus:—" For that which was eclipsed or lost, being of heavenly origin, could be restored only by Him, who first breathed it into man, and that was God, " who created all things *by Jesus Christ;*"* " the power of God and the wisdom of God."—1 Cor. i. 24.

To apply our author's own rule to the fragments of the two texts, with which he has concluded the above reasoning, that is to consider well on what occasion they were written, neither of them will, I believe, appear to be pertinently quoted. The first is Eph. iii. 9, which most evidently relates to the gospel dispensation, the subject of the Epistle. The other is 1 Cor. i. 24, in which the apostle is speaking of the effect of receiving the Christian doctrine. " The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom. But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness, but unto them that are called Christ, [in whose name they preached] the power of God and the wisdom of God." See Rom. i. 16, where the apostle expressly declares " the gospel of Christ," to be " the *power of God unto salvation* to every one that believeth."

" Hence *the* Christian believer," continues our author, " while he receives these and other sacred declarations of Scripture concerning the office and character of Christ into his heart, *by faith*, is led also *by the same faith*, to the acknowledgment of the Unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, not in operation merely, *but in essence;* seeing if Christ be the wisdom and power of God, he must be *One essentially with the Father.*"

These metaphysical conjectures concerning the " *essence*" of the Deity, of which the sacred writers

* Ephes. iii. 9, " These last words *by Jesus Christ*, Dr. Clarke says, are not found in the most ancient copies; and are by the learned Dr. Mills, supposed to have been added here from Col. i. 16." " Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity," p. 28.

are wholly silent, our author does not pretend to deduce from any express declarations of Scripture, but from *faith*, and after all they appear to be nothing more than the Sabellian doctrine; like Henry Tuke, our author, avoids admitting in any sense whatever a *distinction of persons* in the Deity, co-equal and co-eternal, without any inequality or difference, as Trinitarians maintain.*

* I must beg leave again to refer to Dr. Clarke, who observes, S. D. p. 86, that "Eusebius, through all his books against Marcellus, lays it down as the constant known doctrine of the church, that Christ himself is not—*the God over all*; but that these are the peculiar titles of the Father. And he particularly affirms, that whosoever applies these titles to the Son, *cannot be a pious person.* And he adds, that Sabellius was excommunicated as a blasphemer, for this very assertion; as confounding the characters of the Father and the Son." Again, "If any one (says Origen) is disturbed at these expressions, John xvii. 11, 'that they may be *One* as *We* are,' as if we favoured the opinion of those [the Sabellian heretics] who deny the Father and the Son, to be two distinct subsistencies,—let him consider that text (Acts iv. 32) 'All that believed were of one heart and one soul;' and then he will understand this, I and my Father are one thing."—Ibid. p. 119.

"They who are not careful," says Dr. Clarke, ibid. p. 290, "to maintain these personal characters and distinctions, but, while they are solicitous (on the one hand) to avoid the errors of the Arians, affirm (in the contrary extreme) the Son and Holy Spirit to be (indidually with the Father) the *self-existent Being:* these, seeming *in words* to magnify the *name* of the Son and Holy Spirit, *in reality* take away their very *existence*; and so fall unawares into Sabellianism, which is the same with Socinianism."

I would here call the meeting's attention to the last paragraph of the 13th section of Barclay's fifth and sixth Proposition, in order to shew that this is neither his error nor mine, as I have uniformly asserted the scriptural soundness of its doctrine concerning Jesus Christ, whereas my accusers have as constantly refused to say, whether they approve it or not. It is as follows:—"Now as the soul of man dwells otherwise, and in a far more immediate manner, in the head and in the heart, than in the hands or legs, and as the sap, virtue and life of the vine lodgeth otherwise in the stock and root, than in the branches, so God *dwelleth* otherwise in the Man Jesus than in us. We also freely reject the heresy of Apollinarius, who denied him to have any soul, but said the body was only acted by the Godhead. As also the error of Eutyches, who made the manhood to be wholly swallowed up of the Godhead. Wherefore," continues Bar-

Our author in the next place observes, "that Christ received homage, *as a divine character*, without rebuking those by whom it was offered." Doubtless he did, and he was most truly *a divine character*, and well entitled to much higher homage than appears to have been paid him on the two occasions referred to. The first is Matt. viii. 2, where in the received version, the leper whom Jesus afterwards cured is said to have "worshiped him," or more correctly "*did him obeisance.*" The other is John ix. 38, where the man who was blind from his birth, after his eyes were opened, is in like manner said to have worshiped him. The preceding conference between this man and the Jews gives no manner of countenance to the notion that he offered religious worship to Christ on this occasion, for he argues the reality of the miracle with them thus:—"If this Man [Jesus] were not *of God he could do nothing.*"

By our author's reference in a note, p. 15, to Acts x. 25, 26, it appears as if he thought Cornelius offered religious worship to Peter, but if he had well considered that Cornelius was "a devout man, one that feared God and prayed to God always," I should imagine he would have come to a different conclusion.

"Nor is it of little moment," adds our author, "in confirmation of *the true Christian's faith*, that the Father and the Son are *alike* designated Light and Life, *essentially so;* which cannot be assumed of any created being." No! Did not our great Master himself testify, that John the Baptist "was *a burning* and *a shining light?*" John v. 35. Did he not say to his disciples, "Ye are *the light of the world*—let your light so shine before men, that they may see your

clay, speaking in the name and on behalf of the Society, "as *we believe he was a true and real man*, so we *also believe* that he continues *so to be glorified* in the heavens *in soul and body*, by whom God *shall judge the world* in the great and general day of judgment."

good works and glorify *your Father who is in heaven?*"

That Jesus Christ was in a more eminent degree than any other Teacher sent from God a light to the world, no Christian will hesitate to acknowledge, but many to pronounce that the Father and the Son are alike designated light in the sacred writings. One of the texts adduced, 1 John i. 5, refers to God and not to Christ, as attentively marking its connexion with the two next verses, will I might say, demonstrate. How John v. 26, can possibly be thought to support such a proposition, I cannot imagine. For it in effect asserts, in unison with the uniform testimony of Scripture, that all the power of the Son is derived from the Father, and that the power of the Father which is never spoken of in those writings as being in any manner limited, is *original* and *underived*. This is, indeed, a momentous distinction, which our great Lord and Master, whatever powers he possessed, always took care to mark in the strongest terms, and in the most decisive manner. The whole chapter almost may be quoted, to prove how utterly Jesus Christ, when performing the most unquestionable miracles, and proclaiming the great extent of the power he was ordained to exercise, disclaimed any of them being properly speaking his own.* "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself;"† ver. 19. Again, "I can

* John v. 26. "For *as the Father* hath life in *himself*, so hath *he given* to the *Son* to *have life* in *himself*." "It seems, (says Dr. Clarke, S. D. p. 102) from the foregoing vers. 21 and 25, that the word [Life] here signifies the *power of raising from the dead*."

† "What things (saith Epiphanius), the Father doth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father being a Spirit, acts by his *own* authority; but the Son, who is also a Spirit, acts *not* by his *own* authority, as the Father does; but acts after a like manner—ministerially."

"'I can of mine own self do nothing,' saith our Saviour; because he is not of himself; and whosoever receives his *being*, must receive his *power* from another.---The Son then can do nothing of himself,

of mine ownself do nothing, as I hear I judge, and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me." Verse 30.*

Towards the bottom of the same page, our author says, "There can be no evidence of testimony, *in an equal degree certain*, or on which we can so fully rely, as that which is given to us by our holy and blessed Redeemer, who is truth itself;" and who said, "I and my Father are one."†—"If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not: but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in Him." John x. 30, 37, 38.

Of the context of these texts, our author says nothing, and yet no two texts could have been chosen,

but what he seeth the Father do, because he hath no power of himself, but what the Father gave."---Bishop Pearson on the Creed, 4th Edit. p. 34. Or, S. D. p. 156.

* "The Son, (saith Tertullian), always acted by the authority and will of the Father; for the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do." Against Praxeas, chap. 15. Or, S. D. p. 157.

† Not [εἷς, unus] One and the same person; but [ἕν, unum] One and the same thing. The meaning is, (says Dr. Clarke, S. D. p. 104) "Since none can pluck them out of *the Father's* hands, and the Father has communicated *his power* to *the Son;* therefore none can pluck them out of *the Son's* hands: so that being in *the Father's* hands, or being in *the Son's* hands, is in effect one and the same thing."

Dr. Clarke shews, that Tertullian, Novatian, Origen, Alexander of Alexandria, Chrysostom and Basil, so understood the import of the text. It may suffice to adduce part of these testimonies. "If Christ, (says Novatian), had been the Father *as the heretics imagine;* he would have said, I and my Father *am* one [one person]. But one in the neuter gender, [one thing] signifies the agreement of fellowship, not unity of person. So that the Father and Son are *one thing*, by agreement and love. The Apostle Paul also takes notice of the unity of agreement with a difference of persons. He that planteth, saith he, and he that watereth, are one [one thing]. Now every body knows, that yet Apollos was one man and Paul another, and not Paul and Apollos one and the same man."

"When our Lord says, I and my Father are one Thing, he means, (says Chrysostom), one in Power: for concerning that [viz. concerning Power] was his whole discourse."

the import of which is more obvious when the context is "well considered," or more liable to be mistaken for want of it. "Then came the Jews round about him, [Jesus] and said unto him:—How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, [the Messiah whom they looked for like unto Moses] tell us plainly. Jesus answered them; I told you and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand, my Father who gave them me *is greater than all:* and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand, I and my Father are one. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them; Many good works have I shewed you from my Father, [the source of all] for which of these works do ye stone me? The [calumniating] Jews answered him, saying; For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that thou being a man makest thyself God. Jesus answered them; Is it not written in your law, I said ye are Gods? If he call them Gods, to whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, thou blasphemest; because I said I am the Son of God?" That is, the Christ, or the Messiah.* Was ever, I might ask, a

* Here Luke Howard requested permission to point out that this was a *false gloss*, which the Appellant had put upon a very important text of Scripture, saying he was not easy to let it pass by without some notice of it at the present time, in order to prevent the erroneous and injurious impression it might otherwise make in so large an assembly. It was spoken to in the Committee.

I admitted it had been, but not at all to my satisfaction, for I still believed it was *no false gloss*, but the genuine meaning of the text, as I observed before the Committee, John Locke had, in my ap-

vindication more complete, and the falsehood and malignity of an accusation more conclusively established? I believe not.

The effect, however, of the two texts our author has selected, when contemplated by him separately from the context, seem to have made a very different impression on his mind, for after quoting them thus, he says:—"It is true we have an evidence of testimony from the same source, which seems to contravene this assertion; where it is said, 'My Father is greater than I.'"—John xiv. 28.* Had our au-

prehension, most conclusively shewn it to be, in his "Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures."

[See pp. 23, 26, 38, 42, 43, of a new edition of this excellent work, which has been lately published with his Essay, for the understanding of St. Paul's Epistles, and a short account of the Author's life and writings. Johnson & Co. London, price 3s. 6d. in boards; or Locke's works, vol. ii. pp. 518, 519, 523, 525.]

It was, however, my wish, that the Respondents might be allowed the freest liberty to reply to any errors I might, in their apprehension, fall into, as I should be sorry for those errors, to make any hurtful impression for want of being immediately replied to and exposed. As far as I knew my own heart, I might say, there was not a Friend present more desirous than myself of its being done as promptly, plainly and publicly as possible.

The Clerk, however, as a point of order, wished the Respondents rather to make minutes than to interrupt the Appellant, and to reply to whatever they chose after he had been heard.

I then recurred to the text, to shew the connexion, and proceeded as above stated.

* "The plain meaning of the words is, (says Dr. Clarke, S. D. p. 162) that *God* the Father is *greater* than *the Son* absolutely: that he *that begat*, must needs (for that reason, and upon that very account) be *greater*, than *he that is begotten* of him. And that therefore the disciples, *if* they really *loved* him, ought to *rejoice* both for *his* sake and *their own;* that he was going to be exalted to the right hand of the Throne of the Majesty on High, even the Majesty of Him who is *greater than all.*" Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen and several other writers, who have usually been called the fathers of the Christian church, are cited by Dr. Clarke on this subject. Of these early writers Origen seems to have expressed himself the most directly to the point at issue, I shall therefore only adduce his testimony. He says in reply to Celsus, Book viii.—"Be it so, that there are some among us, (as in such a multitude of believers there cannot but be differences of opinion) who rashly suppose, that our Saviour is the

thor "well considered" the immediate context of John x. 30, even the preceding verse only, he might have discovered a still more decisive "testimony from the same source," not even apparently contravening any assertion in the text, but really contradicting his construction of its import. "My Father," says Christ, "*is greater than all.*" As to the union which is hereafter to subsist between him and his Father, and him and his disciples, he says, ver. 20, "At that day ye shall know, that I am in the Father, and you in me, and I in you." But these expressions do not surely imply a personal union between him and his disciples, nor between himself, and that Almighty Being whom he taught us to consider as his Father and our Father, his God and our God.

"The Christian Believer," continues our author "however is not offended at this *seeming contrariety*," namely, that Christ declared the Father to be greater than himself. No, I believe not, for if he has read the sayings of Christ with due attention, and "well considered" their full import, no shadow of contrariety would be found between this, and any other of his recorded declarations concerning himself. They are all, not only really consistent, but obviously harmonious.

Our author tells us, however, that "*the* Christian Believer considers *the two-fold character* sustained by Christ, when these expressions were uttered—the *divine* and *human;* nor does he see, that in order to fulfil the glorious office of Mediator, the blessed Redeemer could possess *less perfectly* the one than *the other*. As partaking of man's nature, he was inferior to the Father; as *possessing* 'all the fulness of the Godhead,' He is One with Him, as said the apostle, 'God blessed for ever.'"

Supreme God over all [the same individual being or person with the Father: which was afterwards the heresy of Sabellius]: *yet* WE *do not think him so; who believe his own words, saying, the Father which sent me, is greater than I.*" S. D. p. 163.

With regard to the above notions respecting the character of Christ, and our author's deductions from them, I shall only observe, that many Christian believers may greatly prefer the more intelligible and consistent testimony of Christ, and of the sacred writers concerning his character and offices in the church, to those, or any other conjectures concerning them.

But I would briefly examine how far the texts appealed to, and in part quoted, can lend those notions any support. The 1st is Col. ii. 9. In the 1st chapter, the apostle after describing Christ as "the image of the invisible God, the head of the church, the first-born from the dead," adds, as his inference, "that in all things he might have the pre-eminence, for it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell." Is the "true meaning" of the apostle then I would ask at all dubious, when in the same Epistle recommending the reception of the Christian doctrine to the Colossians, in its primitive simplicity, uncontaminated by the tradition of men, he reminds them that "in Him [Christ] dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily?"* Especially, as the same apostle says to the Ephesians, "I bow my

* "The fulness of the Godhead;" that is, says Dr. Clarke, "of Divine Power, Dominion and Authority. For so the word θεότης [Divinity] signifies; in the same manner as ἀνθρωπότης, and all other words of the like formation. And it is as great an *abuse* of language, to suppose θεότης [the *Deity*,] that is, the dominion of God, to signify the *substance* of *God;* as it would be to understand ἀνθρωπότης [manhood], to signify the substance of man. Where *Deity* is put (by a mere idiom of the English language) for God himself, as Acts xvii. 29; (in like manner as with us, the King's Majesty often means, not the Majesty of the King, but the King himself;) it is in the Greek not ἡ θεότης, but τὸ θειον."

"Origen styles the Father '*the Fountain of Divinity*.' And he distinctly explains himself to mean thereby that the *Son* is styled *God*, upon account of the authority and dignity *derived to him from the Father;* and that angels and magistrates are styled *Gods*, upon account of the authority and dignity *derived to them through the Son*." S. D. p. 131.

knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. iii. 19.

The common rendering of the other text has been objected to by many learned men, as erroneous and inconsistent with the context. Locke renders it, "he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever." And although in the received version the text is, as our author has quoted it, the early Christian writers "do not apply those words to Christ, but pronounce it to be rashness and impiety to say, that Christ was God over all."* It is not a little remarkable, that

* "The Greek words," says Dr. Clarke, ibid. p. 85, "are of ambiguous construction; and may signify either, of whom Christ came; God who is over all be blessed for ever, amen: or, of whom Christ came, who is over all, God be blessed for ever, amen: or, of whom Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, amen.

"In favour of the two former renderings, may be alleged the use of the word Εὐλογητός, [Blessed,] as applied generally to God the Father, by way of eminence in other places of Scripture; as Dan. iii. 28.; Psalm lxxxix. 52.; Rom. i. 25.; 2 Cor. i. 3., and 11. 31.; Eph. i. 3.; 1 Pet. i. 3.; and in that most remarkable place, Mark xiv. 61.—'Art thou the Christ, the Son of THE BLESSED?'

"To the same purpose it is also very remarkable, that not only the Apostolical Constitutions, and the larger Epistles of Ignatius, (books of dubious authority though very ancient), represent it as a branch of the Gnostick heresy to affirm Christ to be himself absolutely, *the* God over all.—But even Tertullian chargeth upon Praxeas, his styling Christ, 'The Lord God Almighty,' as equivalent to confounding him with the Father himself. And Origen calls it *rashness* (which he would not have done, if he had thought it to be the doctrine of St. Paul), to suppose Christ to be *the God over all;* as being inconsistent with his own words, 'My Father is greater than I.'—However, the words of this text being of ambiguous construction, the latter of the three fore-mentioned renderings, viz. of whom Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever, amen: was pitcht upon by our Translators as the most *obvious.* And indeed, the sense, even as thus expressed in our translation, is not difficult. For as the same apostle tells us, 1 Cor. xv. 27, that when he saith, all things are put under Christ, *it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him:* so here in like manner, when he repeats the very same thing, that *Christ is God over all;* or, as some of ancients seem to have read the text (omitting the word θεός), that *Christ is over all;* and chapter x. 12, that he is *Lord over all;* and Acts x. 36,

in the conclusion of more than twenty prayers of approved ministers in the Society now extant, delivered at public meetings previous to 1695, and taken in short-hand, the very words of this text are adopted, but applied to the Father. Did these men pray with the spirit and with the understanding also, or were they all mistaken in the application of these terms, or is the text in the received version erroneously rendered?

The four first verses of this Epistle if "well considered," render it so clear that in the estimation of the apostle, the Father alone was God over all, that the correction of the above text might almost be justified on that ground only; but the same apostle having assured us elsewhere that to us Christians, there is but one God even the Father, the presumptive evidence against the common reading of this text is as strong as can easily be imagined.

I have thus briefly reviewed such parts of some of the latest approved works which relate to those important points of doctrine, on which I have been called in question, for the sake of shewing how com-

he is *Lord of all;* it is manifest again, that He must needs be excepted, by communication of whose divine power and supreme authority, *Christ* is *God or Lord over all.*"

"Christ, (saith Justin), is Lord of Hosts, *according to the will of the Father* who gave them that power. And Clemens Alexandrinus: *the Lord of all ministering to the will of the Supreme Father.* And again, to Him is subject the whole army of angels and of Gods [alluding to Ps. xcvii. 7, 'Worship him all ye Gods,']—*upon account of him who put all under him.*

"And Tertullian: He is Lord of Hosts, because all things are put under him by his Father.

"And Hippolytus: He is God over all; *for* so he says expressly, 'All things are given unto me of my Father.'

"And Novatian: Having always power over all things, but a power *delivered,* a power *given,* a power *granted* to him from his Father."

Before the Committee of Appeals, Luke Howard represented me as not warranted in stating, that "the early Christian writers" did not apply the words in Rom. ix. 5, to Christ, adding that I should have produced my authorities. This call upon me I have now at-

paratively unimportant those shades of difference, or perhaps only of phraseology are, by which those who unite in rejecting the doctrine of a distinction of persons in the Deity, appear to be divided in opinion. Nor are the practical consequences of any of these variations at all similar to those which naturally spring out of the reception of the doctrine of the Trinity, and have been in fact generally associated with that tenet.

For instance, the doctrine of original sin, or innate depravity, and the opinions usually connected therewith, as our Friend George Stacey, most justly observes, are "doctrines which impugn the power and goodness of God." The reception of these fearful doctrines is hardly compatible with a belief in the simple unity of God, void of all personal relations. Nor do I know that they have ever been associated with any consistent profession of that scriptural doctrine.

The sanction of the Morning Meeting "to the *common* doctrine of the Trinity," in a late work approved by them, I would hope was given rather inadvertently than by design.* The recognition of any new tenet by a religious society, or any new explanation of an old one, where human formularies

tended to, by producing a variety of pertinent passages from the learned and candid Dr. Clarke, and through him, not from "Ebion, Cerinthus and such writers," as the Respondent insinuated, but from those who are generally called the fathers of the Christian church, to whose testimony Barclay has so largely appealed in his Apology.

* This work is entitled, "Remarks suggested by the perusal of a Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism. &c." I would refer to the two first paragraphs, to shew the meeting, in the words of its approved author, his judgment concerning the principles of the Society. He says, on what grounds I know not, "Many attempts have lately been made by Unitarian writers, to identify their faith with that of the Quakers; but it has been sometimes done rather covertly than openly." I do not say such "attempts" have not been made, but if they have, it has not fallen under my notice. Nor can I imagine

of faith are deemed necessary in Christian churches, should at least be "*well considered*," and the import of every proposition, and its agreement with Scripture doctrine be accurately weighed. And even then, experience has largely shewn the ill success of such efforts to promote their professed object, an uniformity of opinion concerning the doctrines of religion.

Perhaps the most plausible forms under which these attempts have been made, are those which are called Scriptural Catechisms. But even in these, although the answers may be expressed in the very terms of Scripture, unless they are also in their true import, rightly applicable to the questions prefixed,

that any writers in much esteem among the Unitarians, would consider such an object of sufficient importance to make any attempt of the kind. If they had, I should most likely have known it.

Your approved author adds, the "Devotional Extracts" were given to the world with this design. Now, as the Editor of this work, I disclaim any such intention. Its object was to shew, what the devotional language of this Meeting had been from 1678 to 1810, by faithful extracts from its annual Epistles during that time, and the most pertinent in each Epistle that I could find. Your author next bears his testimony to the fidelity of this selection, by saying, "but they could not be sufficiently divested of those expressions that ascribe worship to the Saviour, to answer this purpose effectually." They were, however, quite sufficient for mine. Your author continues, "Yet the compiler *perhaps* thought, that to gain half a purpose was better than to gain nothing at all, and might therefore wish to give to the principles of that Society a character irreconcileable *to the common doctrine of the Trinity.*"

If this be not to represent your principles, and that doctrine as coalescing or uniting with each other, I am unable to discover the import of these expressions. But as if it were to remove all doubt of such being the author's intention, he add, "thus endeavouring to consign the Quakers to the invidious condition of the Bat in the fable, neither bird nor beast with all its pernicious consequences."

Such is the language in which this doctrine is recognized as expressly according with the faith of the Society, in a work which your licencers of the press have sanctioned, and which the Meeting for Sufferings have directed to be circulated throughout the nation for the general information of Friends.

nothing can well be more delusive. The doctrines contained in the Scriptures, when viewed in their natural connexion with the context, and above all, when brought " to the standard of Christ's own doctrine," appear to the most advantage, the most honourable to God, the most beneficial to man, and the most likely to produce their proper effect upon the mind.

Only a few years ago, after authorizing the publication of the first part of a Catechism, entitled " Early Christian Instruction," &c. you referred the consideration of continuing the work to the Meeting for Sufferings. It remained under their care no less than two years, when in my mind you very judiciously concurred in a report from that meeting, intimating after so much attention as they must have paid to the subject during that time, that it was too nice an undertaking to enter very minutely into points of doctrine, and to publish the work in the name and on behalf of the Society.

On which ground, if my memory serves me, it was agreed that any thing farther that might be published in pursuance of that object, should appear in the name of an individual, and not under the express sanction of the Society. If I have mistaken the grounds of this conclusion, my apology must be, that I have been refused access to the records. Had I been permitted to consult them on this, and a few other points, I should only have referred to such parts as on examination appeared to me material to my case, and by quoting them correctly, have enabled you, with less loss of time, to determine how far they may affect the questions at issue.

For the same purpose I wished to have shewn, that by another report from the Meeting for Sufferings, which was also read in my hearing, and the minute you made thereon, that the imprimatur rule, which was hastily agreed to in 1801, has been since

that time *virtually repealed*, by the sanction you have given to that meeting to appoint Sub-Committees to inspect periodical publications, and to reply to such articles in them as they might judge necessary. I approved this measure, and considered it from that time as in effect doing away a minute which on the face of it requires to "*be invariably observed.*" And accordingly since that time, persons in every station in the Society, Ministers and Elders not excepted, have acted as if no such rule defaced the book of Extracts. Upon what principle then can the proceedings against me, so far as they are founded on a supposed breach of the above-mentioned imprimatur rule, be consistently justified?

I also wished to see whether the written records of your meeting would confirm, strengthen, or invalidate the very striking picture which Gough has drawn of its eminently tolerant spirit towards George Keith, under all the fanciful, unscriptural notions he entertained, if he would only have been content with openly professing them, and had not insisted on imposing them on his brethren. As the case is stated by Gough, vol. iii. pp. 321, 327—329, 335, and 383, I cannot readily imagine any thing much more directly opposed to the principle of the proceedings in my case. But as it may be objected that Gough has given a partial view of those proceedings, I was desirous of going to the fountain-head for information, that I might know, so far as that could inform me, the real character of those memorable proceedings. I have for many years considered them highly creditable to the Society, and well entitled to its attention and imitation in every subsequent age.

The records of the primitive Christian church, however, contain the best precepts and the brightest examples concerning the exercise of the rights of private judgment. The articles of faith which were then required as requisite for religious fellowship

were few, plain and simple, but highly important and conducive not only to peace and charity, but equally adapted to awaken and to preserve a love of truth, a fearless profession of it, a deep reverence for its author, the God of truth, and a consequent increase of true believers. Contrary maxims have always produced opposite fruits, of which the pages of ecclesiastical history afford mournful, but instructive evidence.

From the period of the Reformation, however, the lumber which had accumulated during the dark ages of the church, has been gradually removing, as the sacred writings have been more freely unfolded; and the professors of Christianity been induced to search the Scriptures, and disregarding the fear of man openly and freely to avow the result of their examination. During the whole of this contest, the two parties forming in fact the Christian world, have been divided in opinion on two principles which are irreconcileably opposed to each other. The one assumes, that, the Christian church is from time to time duly authorized to propound articles of faith in unscriptural terms, and to impose them on its members. The pleas for exercising this power in substance are, the supposed danger of diversity of opinion from reading the Scriptures, without the aid of an authorized comment by the church, and the supposed safety of relying on its spiritual discernment.*

* As the proceedings in this and in other similar cases appear to be taken up, to secure the church from the danger and imputation of heresy and schism, I would refer the reader to John Locke's postscript to his first Letter on Toleration, where he has very conclusively shewn, that the pursuit of such objects by any church, is to incur those imputations which it proposes to guard against. That those only are or can be Heretics or Schismatics, who separate themselves from any church, holding the Scriptures to be the sole rule of faith, because she "does not publicly profess some certain opinions which the Holy Scriptures do not expressly teach;" or those who under the same profession, however numerous or powerful, exclude others out

The other and more ancient principle which was held before "the Gospel Dove was strangled in the embraces of the Imperial Eagle," asserts the sufficiency and the plainness of the Scriptures in a correct text or translation, in all that regards faith and worship, without the assistance of note or comment. It claims for every Christian an equal and unalienable right to examine their testimony, and to judge of it for himself; and consequently denies the right of any church or assembly to require of its members a profession of any articles of faith which are not plainly and expressly laid down as such, in the New Testament.

The Church of Rome holds one of these principles. All consistent Protestants adhere to the other. Any infringement of it is to violate the sacred, the fundamental principle whereon the Reformation was founded, and can alone be justified. The last number of the Philanthropist contains in a Review of "Gilpin's Lives of the Reformers," so clear and so masterly a defence of that principle, that I cannot forbear quoting one paragraph from it. It is as follows:—

"If the propriety of translating the Scriptures be established and acknowledged, other consequences follow which are not in general observed. The translation of the Scriptures is only good, if schism and dissent are good, and not otherwise. If schism and dissent are evil, so also is the translation of the Scriptures. If the opinions of the church are alone to be followed, and if the adoption of any other opinions is evil, the proper course undoubtedly is to confine the Bible to those who manufacture the opinions of the church, and to give to the people only the opinions which are made for them. The Church of

of her communion, because they will not profess their belief of certain opinions which are not the express words of Scripture.---"Both these," says Locke, "*are heretics*, because they err in fundamentals, and err obstinately *against knowledge*." Works, vol. ii. p. 266.

Rome reasoned accurately and consistently, by refusing the use of the Bible to the laity, when it established their incompetency to form opinions for themselves. The Church of England manifests a woful incapacity of reasoning, when it maintains that the Bible should be translated and read, and yet that there is any duty or propriety whatsoever in following the opinions of the parish priest more than the opinions of any other man. Surely the reading of the Bible is good only, if it is good to judge of it according to the dictates of the reader's understanding. It can answer no other purpose. If this is not good, it is merciful to keep the Bible out of his hands; it is merciful to keep him from the chance and from the temptation of error. Whoever talks of schism and dissent as any thing else than desirable and good,* is in reality, therefore, not a Protestant; he avows the very principle of Popish tyranny and the source of Popish corruption; he lays down the servitude of the human mind as the foundation of his system; he actually, and in truth condemns the translation and perusal of the Bible. So very nearly are Popish high church and Protestant high church related!" Vol. iv. p. 126.

Recognizing these principles as purely Christian and Protestant, it is evident I cannot consistently look to you for any authoritative confirmation of any doctrines or opinions which appear to me sound and scriptural. But I do look to *some* of the Respondents to shew how they imagine such principles can be

* Here Luke Howard inquired, whether I meant to assert that schism and dissent were good in themselves, as the passage just read seemed to imply? I replied, the Committee may see that it is rather the comparative than the positive good of schism and dissent of which this passage speaks. But I have no hesitation in expressing my firm persuasion, that any evils attendant upon the freest avowal of dissent even from doctrines both true and important, are far less than those which necessarily flow from discouraging or restraining in any manner the exercise of the rights of private judgment.

openly avowed and publicly countenanced, consistently with an approval of those inquisitorial and intolerant proceedings which they are appointed to defend.

I am at present utterly unable to comprehend this, but I shall be willing to listen with attention to their explanation; and I can truly say, whatever variation of sentiment there may be, between any of my fellow-professors of faith in Christ Jesus, within the Society in which I was born and educated, and those which I entertain, I have no desire to obtrude my sentiments upon others farther than they are true, and appear so to their understandings.*

I am very ready to allow that there is no merit whatever in merely holding true doctrines, however commendable it may be to search after religious truth,

* I have, however, much reason to conclude, that the proceedings against me chiefly arose from the offence certain Disciplinarians had taken at the occasional expression of my sentiments *in Meetings for Discipline*. The Monthly Meeting's Committee let out this secret at their first visit, by expressing the dissatisfaction of Friends at my general conduct in this respect "*for ten years past.*" See my Narrative, pp. 63, 100, 125, 126, and pp. v.—viii. of the preface. The Respondents on this appeal betrayed a *similar feeling*, by describing me as attending their "*Meetings for Discipline*" and "*legislating for them*," because I sometimes expressed my sentiments on subjects under consideration. Another cause for my expulsion, with the *secret junta*, who all along prompted the agents ostensibly employed, *to deal* with me, was, I have no doubt, to deprive me *through the medium of disownment*, of the hitherto acknowledged right of its members to inspect the records of the Society. The new and absolute restriction of this right was expressly made on a mere *ex parte* statement of the present Clerk of the records, to the Meeting for Sufferings, that I had claimed this right, which had never before been denied me. To the jealousy thus excited among the ruling Disciplinarians, "*the many Friends of other meetings*," with whom these proceedings originated, and by whom they were supported, I attribute the cause of my expulsion, much more than to any of the grounds on which it was ostensibly founded. This will not surprise the candid reader, when he considers the above circumstances, and the pertinacity with which I was refused all access to the records, as related in pp. 25—27 of this work. If, however, this conjecture be ill-founded, I hope it will be distinctly shewn to be erroneous.

as after a treasure of inestimable value ; nor any demerit in not attaining a correct knowledge of doctrinal truths, unless it arises from blamable negligence, indifference, or the prevalence of a worldly spirit.

It is, however, highly important to us all, to be faithful to our convictions of truth, after we have sought it diligently in the love of it, and to be obedient to the practical precepts of the gospel, and to that law which was to be written under the new covenant, not upon tables of stone, but upon the fleshly tables of the heart, whether it has pleased infinite wisdom to confer upon us the five, the ten talents, or the one talent only. Our business, is faithfully to occupy therewith till Christ shall come, "and then he will reward every man according to his works." Matt. xvi. 27.

Duly contemplating these solemn truths, and that unavoidable diversity of sentiment which arises out of the very constitution of our nature, as the workmanship of God, and created in his image, let us with increasing assiduity cultivate that healing spirit of love and charity, which our divine Master declared to be the best mark of discipleship. May we also be more and more animated by the cheering prospect held out to us by the gospel, of meeting hereafter, under happier circumstances for distinguishing truth from error and communicating our thoughts one to another, when we shall no longer see things as through a glass darkly, but know even as we are known.

Having delivered the foregoing address to a very large and attentive audience, consisting I suppose of about twelve hundred persons, I sat down. After a short pause, the Clerk asked, if I had any thing more to offer to the Meeting?

I replied, I have not, except it be to say that I hope the Respondents will be satisfied with vindicating in the best manner they are able the recorded

charges against me, or at least will not attempt as they did before the Committee, to make me responsible for the soundness of opinions which I have never maintained, or for whatever they may deem objectionable in the works circulated by the London Unitarian Book Society. In becoming one of its subscribers I had no idea that I thereby made myself accountable for all which those works might contain. Nor would I have joined this or any other Society upon such terms, either expressed or understood.

Some works are admitted into its catalogue which are known to contain sentiments adverse even to its fundamental principles. These, it is nevertheless thought, may promote a spirit of inquiry, and thereby aid the cause of truth. The works of the late Archdeacon Blackburne, an able assertor of the rights of private judgment, are of this number, and contain strong censures on Unitarianism, which was far from being consonant with the Archdeacon's views of scriptural doctrine. I might, therefore, on the plea the Respondents have urged, be accused of being a Trinitarian, and in fact of holding at the same time directly opposite tenets. There is not, I am fully persuaded, a single member of this Book Society who considers himself responsible for the soundness of any of its works, except it be so far only as they are conformable to the genuine doctrines of Revelation, as laid down in the Scriptures. And of this, we wish every person, to judge for himself.

Such are the principles of our Association, as avowed in the Preface to our Book of Rules, which the Respondents must have entirely mistaken or overlooked, or surely they could never have imputed to me an approval of opinions merely because they appeared to them to be erroneous, and were to be found in some of its publications. I therefore solemnly protest against the injustice of attempting to make me responsible for any thing more than its fundamental principles, on account of my connexion with this Book Society.

The Respondents being now called upon to reply, Josiah Forster rose, and said:—"We are appointed to defend *the decision* of the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, in confirming the disownment of Thomas Foster, by Ratcliff Monthly Meeting, not to enter into so large a field of irrelevant matter as the Appellant has chosen to adduce.*

* In p. 49, I expressed an opinion that the reply of the Respondents before the Committee of Appeals, "was neither consistent nor scriptural." The above definition, before so large an assembly, of what they are "appointed to defend," reminded me of the grounds on which that "*decision*" was built. Before the Committee, the Respondents defended "*the decision*" as proper and necessary, but they seldom adverted to any of the most material parts of the proceedings on which that decision was founded, without making such concessions as with competent and impartial judges would have been fatal to the cause they were appointed to advocate. For instance, there was no rule of the Society which bore on the case. It was not a very strong Monthly Meeting that took it up.—Its Committee in their conferences with the Appellant did their best---and adduced such texts of Scripture as *they thought* pertinent, which, whether relevant or *not*, equally shewed their care. As to their questioning the Appellant, and in some other respects the proceedings were not such as the Respondents could have wished. In their report to the Monthly Meeting, the Committee expressed themselves *as they thought* correctly.---In short, it might have been better if the proceedings had been more judicious, correct and regular, less inquisitorial and precipitate. Yet, with all these acknowledged defects, were they in effect held up in the lump as being founded "*in the power and wisdom of God!!*" The following minute was quoted for this purpose.

"Our Monthly and Quarterly Meetings being set up by the power and in the wisdom of God, which is the authority of those meetings, all Friends are tenderly desired and advised carefully to keep to, and in that authority; and therein manage all the business and affairs of the said meetings, in discharge of their duty to God and his church; and not expect or depend upon this meeting for particular direction from time to time, how they shall proceed in the management of the concerns of those meetings, relating to truth's testimony and service; but wait for, and depend upon, the power and wisdom of God for counsel and direction, in such matters and cases as may come before them." Book of Extracts, p. 43.

As to many of the opinions imputed to me as erroneous, the Respondents did not deem it necessary to shew, I had ever professed them; nor to compare them with Scripture doctrine to prove they were erroneous. Their principal test of truth appeared to be the doctrine which *they imagined* George Fox preached, and his fol-

"It does not appear to be our duty on this occasion to go into any general defence of the doctrines of Christianity, but to prove that the Appellant has promoted the circulation of doctrines contrary to those held by the Society. If it were to be understood that any general discussion of doctrines was proper to be entered into on such an occasion, rules for conducting the disputation ought to be laid down. But I suppose the meeting will not hold the Respondents under any obligation to discuss such subjects as the Appellant has introduced, a great part of which do not properly relate to the case at issue."

Luke Howard, now rose, and said, "I shall, however, claim the right, not so much in the character of a Respondent, as in that of a Member of the Yearly Meeting, to reply to such parts of the Appellant's address as I may deem necessary, in order to remove the injurious impression they may have made; and especially to point out at a proper time, as I suppose the meeting will not sit much longer this evening, a *false gloss* which the Appellant put on a very important text of Scripture."

The Clerk observed, "The Respondents have an undoubted right *as such*, to use their own discretion in replying to whatever parts of the Appellant's address they may think proper. But I feel myself called upon to say, they can only claim to be heard on the case before the meeting, in the character of Respondents. It is my wish to act with strict impartiality."

Several of the Respondents plainly indicated dissatisfaction with this judgment of the Clerk, but without re-asserting their claim. Luke Howard

lowers held. Of these, such as were supposed to favour their own views were held up, as being almost of divine authority, whilst others, although more plain, rational, consistent and scriptural, though professed by the same writers, or sanctioned by the Society under a *modern* imprimatur rule, were represented as not implicating the Society, and of no authority whatever---the mere sentiments of fallible individuals.

rose again, saying, "The Appellant has adduced in his defence, the opinions of several individuals on points of doctrine. He has canvassed the sentiments of Henry Tuke, of Wm. Candler, of George Stacey, and of Wm. Allen.* He has tried a number of passages in a work of George Stacey's, by the evidence and authority of the late Dr. Samuel Clarke. All this I deem irrelevant matter, and I hope the meeting will consider the Respondents as disclaiming much that the Appellant has advanced, although they might not particularly reply to such parts of his address."

Wm. Tuke and several other Friends said, that a large proportion of what the meeting had heard from the Appellant was irrelevant matter, such as he ought not to have been allowed to produce; and some general cautions were thrown out to those who were present, and especially to the youth, to be upon their guard against the hurtful impressions it might have made; and an earnest wish was expressed, that those who had heard the Appellant might as much as they well could, attend the next afternoon to hear the reply of the Respondents. I cordially approved this recommendation, and could hardly forbear seconding it; but I waved so doing, as being unnecessary, after what I had before said.

* I think it cannot be said, that I expressly canvassed any of the opinions of Wm. Allen, in my address to the meeting, or even alluded to any he had held or countenanced, except it was to approve them. In an early part of it, p. 63, I did, it is true, call upon the Respondents to take some appropriate notice of my still unanswered address to the Quarterly Meeting, as inserted in my Narrative (pp. 256---295, and 300---335) long since in their hands. In this work there are some remarks in the form of notes, on the impressive speech of Wm. Allen in that meeting. See pp. 359---363.---Perhaps Luke Howard referred to these, as I do not know that I ever canvassed any other opinions of William Allen's. And if so, I recommend those remarks once more to his cool examination. They are well worthy his attention, and were sent me as I acknowledged by a Friend of mine, who heard the speech delivered, and was in common with many others sensible of the effect it produced.

Stephen Grellet, a minister from America, on a religious visit to this country, commended the orderly deportment of those who had attended the discussion. The meeting adjourned about half after six to four the next afternoon.

APPENDIX.

AN

ESSAY ON ENTHUSIASM,

BY JOHN LOCKE,

BEING

THE NINETEENTH CHAPTER OF THE FOURTH BOOK OF HIS ESSAY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING.

Sect. 1. *Love of Truth necessary.*

HE that would seriously set upon the search of truth, ought in the first place to prepare his mind with a love of it: for he that loves it not, will not take much pains to get it, nor be much concerned when he misses it. There is nobody in the commonwealth of learning, who does not profess himself a lover of truth: and there is not a rational creature that would not take it amiss to be thought otherwise of. And yet, for all this, one may truly say, there are very few lovers of truth for truth's sake, even amongst those who persuade themselves that they are so. How a man may know whether he be so in earnest, is worth inquiry: and I think there is this one unerring mark of it, *viz.* the not entertaining any proposition with greater assurance, than the proofs it is built upon will warrant. Whoever goes beyond this measure of assent, it is plain, receives not truth in the love of it; loves not truth for truth's sake, but for some other by-end. For the evidence that any

proposition is true, (except such as are self-evident), lying only in the proofs a man has of it, whatsoever degrees of assent he affords it beyond the degrees of that evidence, it is plain all that surplusage of assurance is owing to some other affection, and not to the love of truth: it being as impossible, that the love of truth should carry my assent above the evidence there is to me, that it is true, as that the love of truth should make me assent to any proposition, for the sake of that evidence, which it has not, that it is true; which is, in effect, to love it as a truth, because it is possible or probable that it may not be true. In any truth that gets not possession of our minds by the irresistible light of self-evidence, or by the force of demonstration, the arguments that gain it assent, are the vouchers and gage of its probability to us; and we can receive it for no other than such as they deliver it to our understandings. Whatsoever credit or authority we give to any proposition more than it receives from the principles and proofs it supports itself upon, is owing to our inclinations that way, and is so far a derogation from the love of truth, as such: which, as it can receive no evidence from our passions or interests, so it should receive no tincture from them.

Sect. 2. A Forwardness to dictate, from whence.

The assuming an authority of dictating to others, and a forwardness to prescribe to their opinions, is a constant concomitant of this bias and corruption of our judgments: for how almost can it be otherwise, but that he should be ready to impose on others' belief, who has already imposed on his own? Who can reasonably expect arguments and conviction from him, in dealing with others, whose understanding is not accustomed to them in his dealing with himself? Who does violence to his own faculties, tyrannizes over his own mind, and usurps the prero-

gative that belongs to truth alone, which is to command assent by only its own authority, *i. e.* by and in proportion to that evidence which it carries with it.

Sect. 3. *Force of Enthusiasm.*

Upon this occasion I shall take the liberty to consider a third ground of assent, which, with some men, has the same authority, and is as confidently relied on as either faith or reason: I mean enthusiasm; which, laying by reason, would set up revelation without it. Whereby, in effect, it takes away both reason and revelation, and substitutes in the room of it the ungrounded fancies of a man's own brain, and assumes them for a foundation both of opinion and conduct.

Sect. 4. *Reason and Revelation.*

Reason is natural revelation, whereby the eternal Father of light, and fountain of all knowledge, communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties: revelation is natural reason enlarged by a new set of discoveries communicated by God immediately, which reason vouches the truth of, by the testimony and proofs it gives, that they come from God. So that he that takes away reason, to make way for revelation, puts out the light of both, and does much the same, as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope.

Sect. 5. *Rise of Enthusiasm.*

Immediate revelation being a much easier way for men to establish their opinions, and regulate their conduct, than the tedious and not always successful labour of strict reasoning, it is no wonder that some

have been very apt to pretend to revelation, and to persuade themselves that they are under the peculiar guidance of heaven in their actions and opinions, especially in those of them which they cannot account for by the ordinary methods of knowledge, and principles of reason. Hence we see, that, in all ages, men, in whom melancholy has mixed with devotion, or whose conceit of themselves has raised them into an opinion of a greater familiarity with God, and a nearer admittance to his favour, than is afforded to others, have often flattered themselves with a persuasion of an immediate intercourse with the Deity, and frequent communications from the Divine Spirit. God, I own, cannot be denied to be able to enlighten the understanding by a ray darted into the mind immediately from the fountain of light. This they understand, he has promised to do; and who then has so good a title to expect it, as those who are his peculiar people, chosen by him, and depending on him?

Sect. 6. Enthusiasm.

Their minds being thus prepared, whatever groundless opinion comes to settle itself strongly upon their fancies, is an illumination from the Spirit of God, and presently of divine authority; and whatsoever odd action they find in themselves a strong inclination to do, that impulse is concluded to be a call or direction from heaven, and must be obeyed; it is a commission from above, and they cannot err in executing it.

§ 7. This I take to be properly enthusiasm, which, though founded neither on reason nor divine revelation, but rising from the conceits of a warmed or overweening brain, works yet, where it once gets footing, more powerfully on the persuasions and actions of men, than either of those two, or both together: men being most forwardly obedient to the impulses they receive from themselves; and the

whole man is sure to act more vigorously, where the whole man is carried by a natural motion. For strong conceit, like a new principle, carries all easily with it, when got above common sense, and freed from all restraint of reason and check of reflection, it is heightened into a divine authority, in concurrence with our own temper and inclination.

Sect. 8. *Enthusiasm mistaken for Seeing and Feeling.*

Though the odd opinions and extravagant actions enthusiasm has run men into, were enough to warn them against this wrong principle, so apt to misguide them both in their belief and conduct; yet the love of something extraordinary, the ease and glory it is to be inspired, and be above the common and natural ways of knowledge, so flatters many men's laziness, ignorance and vanity, that when once they are got into this way of immediate revelation, of illumination without search, and of certainty without proof, and without examination, it is a hard matter to get them out of it. Reason is lost upon them; they are above it: they see the light infused into their understandings, and cannot be mistaken; it is clear and visible there, like the light of bright sunshine; shews itself, and needs no other proof, but its own evidence; they feel the hand of God moving them within, and the impulses of the spirit, and cannot be mistaken in what they feel. Thus they support themselves, and are sure reason hath nothing to do with what they see and feel in themselves; what they have a sensible experience of, admits no doubt, needs no probation. Would he not be ridiculous who should require to have it proved to him, that the light shines, and that he sees it? It is its own proof, and can have no other. When the Spirit brings light into our minds, it dispels darkness. We see it, as we do that of the sun at noon, and need not the twilight of reason to shew it us. This light

from heaven is strong, clear and pure; carries its own demonstration with it; and we may as rationally take a glow-worm to assist us to discover the sun, as to examine the celestial ray by our dim candle, reason.

§ 9. This is the way of talking of these men: they are sure, because they are sure; and their persuasions are right, only because they are strong in them. For, when what they say is stripped of the metaphor of seeing and feeling, this is all it amounts to; and yet these similes so impose on them, that they serve them for certainty in themselves, and demonstration to others.

Sect. 10. *Enthusiasm, how to be discovered.*

But to examine a little soberly this internal light, and this feeling on which they build so much: these men have, they say, clear light, and they see: they have an awakened sense, and they feel: this cannot, they are sure, be disputed them. For, when a man says he sees or he feels, nobody can deny it him that he does so. But here let me ask; this seeing, is it the perception of the truth of the proposition, or of this, that it is a revelation from God? This feeling, is it a perception of an inclination or fancy to do something, or of the Spirit of God moving that inclination? These are two very different perceptions, and must be carefully distinguished, if we would not impose upon ourselves. I may perceive the truth of a proposition, and yet not perceive that it is an immediate revelation from God. I may perceive the truth of a proposition in Euclid, without its being, or my perceiving it to be a revelation: nay, I may perceive I came not by this knowledge in a natural way, and so may conclude it revealed, without perceiving that it is a revelation from God; because there be spirits, which, without being divinely commissioned, may excite those ideas in me, and lay them in such order before my mind, that I may per-

ceive their connexion. So that the knowledge of any proposition coming into my mind, I know not how, is not a perception that it is from God. Much less is a strong persuasion, that it is true, a perception that it is from God, or so much as true. But however it be called light and seeing, I suppose, it is at most but belief and assurance: and the proposition taken for a revelation, is not such as they know to be true, but take to be true. For where a proposition is known to be true, revelation is needless: and it is hard to conceive how there can be a revelation to any one of what he knows already. If therefore it be a proposition which they are persuaded, but do not know to be true, whatever they may call it, it is not seeing, but believing. For these are two ways, whereby truth comes into the mind, wholly distinct, so that one is not the other. What I see I know to be so by the evidence of the thing itself; what I believe, I take to be so upon the testimony of another: but this testimony I must know to be given, or else what ground have I of believing? I must see that it is God that reveals this to me, or else I see nothing. The question then here is, how do I know that God is the revealer of this to me; that this impression is made upon my mind by his Holy Spirit, and that therefore I ought to obey it? If I know not this, how great soever the assurance is that I am possessed with, it is groundless; whatever light I pretend to, it is but enthusiasm. For whether the proposition supposed to be revealed, be in itself evidently true, or visibly probable, or by the natural ways of knowledge uncertain, the proposition that must be well-grounded and manifested to be true, is this, that God is the revealer of it, and that what I take to be a revelation, is certainly put into my mind by him, and is not an illusion, dropped in by some other spirit, or raised by my own fancy. For, if I mistake not, these men receive it for true, because they presume God revealed it. Does it not then stand them upon,

to examine on what grounds they presume it to be a revelation from God? Or else all their confidence is mere presumption; and this light they are so dazzled with, is nothing but an *ignis fatuus*, that leads them continually round in this circle. It is a revelation, because they firmly believe it; and they believe it, because it is a revelation.

Sect. 14. *Enthusiasm fails of Evidence, that the Proposition is from God.*

In all that is of divine revelation, there is need of no other proof, but that it is an inspiration from God: for he can neither deceive, nor be deceived. But how shall it be known, that any proposition in our minds, is a truth infused by God; a truth that is revealed to us by him, which he declares to us, and therefore we ought to believe? Here it is that enthusiasm fails of the evidence it pretends to. For men thus possessed, boast of a light whereby, they say, they are enlightened, and brought into the knowledge of this or that truth. But if they know it to be a truth, they must know it to be so either by its own self-evidence to natural reason, or by the rational proofs that make it out to be so. If they see and know it to be a truth either of these two ways, they in vain suppose it to be a revelation. For they know it to be true by the same way that any other man naturally may know that it is so, without the help of revelation. For thus all the truths, of what kind soever, that men uninspired are enlightened with, came into their minds, and are established there. If they say they know it to be true, because it is a revelation from God, the reason is good: but then it will be demanded, how they know it to be a revelation from God. If they say by the light it brings with it, which shines bright in their minds, and they cannot resist; I beseech them to consider, whether this be any more than what we have taken notice of

already, *viz.* that it is a revelation, because they strongly believe it to be true. For all the light they speak of is but a strong, though ungrounded persuasion of their own minds, that it is a truth. For rational grounds from proofs, that it is a truth, they must acknowledge to have none; for then it is not received as a revelation, but upon the ordinary grounds that other truths are received: and if they believe it to be true, because it is a revelation, and have no other reason for its being a revelation, but because they are fully persuaded, without any other reason, that it is true, they believe it to be a revelation, only because they strongly believe it to be a revelation; which is a very unsafe ground to proceed on, either in our tenets or actions: and what readier way can there be to run ourselves into the most extravagant errors and miscarriages, than thus to set up fancy for our supreme and sole guide, and to believe any proposition to be true, any action to be right, only because we believe it to be so? The strength of our persuasions is no evidence at all of their own rectitude: crooked things may be as stiff and inflexible as straight; and men may be as positive and peremptory in error as in truth. How come else the untractable zealots in different and opposite parties? For if the light, which every one thinks he has in his mind, which in this case is nothing but the strength of his own persuasion, be an evidence that it is from God, contrary opinions may have the same title to be inspirations; and God will be not only the Father of lights, but of opposite and contradictory lights, leading men contrary ways; and contradictory propositions will be divine truths, if an ungrounded strength of assurance be an evidence, that any proposition is a divine revelation.

Sect. 12. *Firmness of Persuasion, no Proof that any Proposition is from God.*

This cannot be otherwise, whilst firmness of per-

suasion is made the cause of believing, and confidence of being in the right, is made an argument of truth. St. Paul himself believed he did well, and that he had a call to it, when he persecuted the Christians, whom he confidently thought in the wrong: but yet it was he, and not they, who were mistaken. Good men are men still, liable to mistakes, and are sometimes warmly engaged in errors, which they take for divine truths, shining in their minds with the clearest light.

Sect. 13. *Light in the Mind, what.*

Light, true light in the mind is, or can be nothing else but the evidence of the truth of any proposition; and if it be not a self-evident proposition, all the light it has, or can have, is from the clearness and validity of those proofs upon which it is received. To talk of any other light in the understanding, is to put ourselves in the dark, or in the power of the prince of darkness, and, by our own consent, to give ourselves up to delusion, to believe a lie: for if strength of persuasion be the light which must guide us, I ask, how shall any one distinguish between the delusions of Satan, and the inspirations of the Holy Ghost? He can transform himself into an angel of light. And they who are led by this son of the morning, are as fully satisfied of the illumination, *i. e.* are as strongly persuaded that they are enlightend by the Spirit of God, as any one who is so: they acquiesce and rejoice in it, are acted by it; and nobody can be more sure, nor more in the right, (if their own strong belief may be judge), than they.

Sect. 14. *Revelation must be judged of by Reason.*

He therefore that will not give himself up to all the extravagancies of delusion and error, must bring this guide of his light within to the trial. God,

when he makes the prophet, does not unmake the man: he leaves all his faculties in their natural state, to enable him to judge of his inspirations, whether they be of divine original or no. When he illuminates the mind with supernatural light, he does not extinguish that which is natural. If he would have us assent to the truth of any proposition, he either evidences that truth by the usual methods of natural reason, or else makes it known to be a truth, which he would have us assent to, by his authority, and convinces us that it is from him, by some marks which reason cannot be mistaken in. Reason must be our last judge and guide in every thing. I do not mean, that we must consult reason, and examine whether a proposition revealed from God can be made out by natural principles; and if it cannot, that then we may reject it: but consult it we must, and by it examine whether it be a revelation from God or no: and if reason finds it to be revealed from God, reason then declares for it, as much as for any other truth, and makes it one of her dictates. Every conceit that thoroughly warms our fancies, must pass for an inspiration, if there be nothing but the strength of our persuasions, whereby to judge of our persuasions. If reason must not examine their truth by something extrinsical to the persuasions themselves, inspirations and delusions, truth and falsehood, will have the same measure, and will not be possible to be distinguished.

Sect. 15. *Belief no Proof of Revelation.*

If this internal light, or any proposition which under that title we take for inspired, be conformable to the principles of reason, or to the word of God, which is attested revelation, reason warrants it, and we may safely receive it for true, and be guided by it in our belief and actions: if it receive no testimony nor evidence from either of these rules, we cannot take it for a revelation, or so much as for true, till we

have some other mark that it is a revelation, besides our believing that it is so. Thus we see the holy men of old, who had revelations from God, had something else besides that internal light of assurance in their own minds, to testify to them that it was from God. They were not left to their own persuasions alone, that those persuasions were from God, but had outward signs to convince them of the author of those revelations. And when they were to convince others, they had a power given them to justify the truth of their commission from heaven; and by visible signs to assert the divine authority of a message they were sent with. Moses saw the bush burn without being consumed, and heard a voice out of it. This was something besides finding an impulse upon his mind to go to Pharaoh, that he might bring his brethren out of Egypt; and yet he thought not this enough to authorize him to go with that message, till God, by another miracle of his rod turned into a serpent, had assured him of a power to testify his mission by the same miracle repeated before them whom he was sent to. Gideon was sent by an angel to deliver Israel from the Midianites, and yet he desired a sign to convince him that this commission was from God. These, and several the like instances to be found among the prophets of old, are enough to shew, that they thought not an inward seeing or persuasion of their own minds, without any other proof, a sufficient evidence that it was from God, though the Scripture does not every where mention their demanding or having such proofs.

§ 16. In what I have said, I am far from denying that God can, or doth sometimes enlighten men's minds in the apprehending of certain truths, or excite them to good actions, by the immediate influence and assistance of the Holy Spirit, without any extraordinary signs accompanying it. But in such cases too, we have reason and Scripture, unerring rules, to know whether it be from God or no. Where the

truth embraced is consonant to the revelation in the written word of God, or the action conformable to the dictates of right reason or holy writ, we may be assured that we run no risk in entertaining it as such; because though perhaps it be not an immediate revelation from God, extraordinarily operating on our minds, yet we are sure it is warranted by that revelation which he has given us of truth. But it is not the strength of our private persuasion within ourselves, that can warrant it to be a light or motion from heaven; nothing can do that, but the written word of God without us, or that standard of reason, which is common to us with all men. Where reason or Scripture is express for any opinion or action, we may receive it as of divine authority; but it is not the strength of our own persuasions which can by itself give it that stamp. The bent of our own minds may favour it as much as we please; that may shew it to be a fondling of our own, but will by no means prove it to be an offspring of heaven, and of divine original.

Printed by Stower & Smallfield, Hackney.

INDEX.

A.

Addresses of the Appellant to the Yearly Meeting, 55—74—108. Replies to, commencement of by the Respondents 109—111
Allen, William, a Respondent, 3, his opinions whether canvassed by the Appellant 111
Apology of Barclay quoted 89, 90
Apostolic Epistles, obscure or difficult passages, to what test they should be brought 86
Appeal, notice of, 2, renewed 15, copy of 35—47, contains a plain and full summary of the case 63
Appeals in print, or that have been printed not to be received 2
Appeals, Committee of chosen 33
Appellant, why disowned 2
Appellant's reasons for exercising the right of Appeal stated, 44—46
——— not allowed to attempt removing the prejudices excited in his judges 48—51,52
Aspland, Robert, his Plea for Unitarian Dissenters quoted 70—74

B.

Barclay, not a Sabellian 89, 90
Barnard, Hannah, why disowned 12
Bevan, Joseph Gurney, his speech in the Quarterly Meeting 17
Bishops and other Divines generally persecutors in 1611 60, 61
Book Society, the Unitarian 35, 36, 65—76
Book of Extracts 109
Breviloquus, his idea of omnipotence 77
Bowman, Rd. a Respondent 3

C.

Cases of George Keith and Hannah Barnard compared 12
Candler, William, work of reviewed 83
Catechism, 1st part of one published, why not completed 101
Catechisms, Scriptural, plausible but delusive 100, 101
Creed, Athanasian, rejected by Unitarians 70
Christ, the Messiah, or the Son of God, *synonymous terms* as used by the sacred writers 93, 94
Christ, Deity of, not taught in the Scriptures 81
Christianity, all its essential doctrines taught by Christ and recorded in the gospels 87

Christian writers, the ancient, pronounce it impiety to say that Christ is God over all 97, 98
——— did not apply the words in Rom. ix. 5, to Christ ibid.
Christian believers not bound to believe unscriptural doctrines 87
Christian Observer, Henry Tuke's Letter to the Editors of 85
———, the Editors' remarks on ibid.
Church of Rome frames and imposes articles of faith on its members 103
Churches, Protestant, should have no articles of faith but the Scriptures 104
Claridge, Rd., his Defence of Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken 58
Clarke, Dr. Samuel, his attempt to reform the Liturgy 82
——— notes from his Scripture doctrine of the Trinity, 88, 89, 91, 92, 94, 96, 97
Clarke, Dr. Adam, his Eulogy of the authorized text of the Scriptures, and of the translators 62
Committee of Appeals, list of, 33, 34.—1st sitting of, 34—48.—2d and 3d sittings, 49—51. Report of, 53. Its members not allowed a copy of a paper explaining the grounds of its decision 55
Concessions of the Respondents compared with their claims, 109, 110

D.

Decision of a Committee of Appeals, according to rule, the grounds of to be explained 29
———, this rule dispensed with 54, 55
Defamation and Detraction a Christian duty, to oppose 15, 16
Deity of the Father always held by Christians of every age 81
Deity of Christ, those who profess to believe, seldom agree in what sense it should be held 81
Divine influence on the human mind, doctrine of, true and important 78—80
Divinity of Christ, not ascribed by Friends to the Man Christ Jesus, but to that divine power which dwelt in him 37, 78
——— only to be professed in a scriptural sense 84, 85
Detraction, rule respecting, how observed 57
Devotional and Doctrinal Extracts, object of 5—7
Discipline among the Quakers, its proper nature and extent pref. vi—viii
Dissent whether evil or good 104
Doctrine, different views of 86

E.

Eliot, John, a Respondent 3, 24, 34
Elwall, Edward, attended Friends' Meetings, and why 82
Euthusiasm, what 115—117
Enthusiasts, reason lost upon 117

F.

Forster, Josiah, a Respondent 3
———'s speech in the Yearly Meeting 109—110

Fox, George 109
Fuller's Eulogy on King James's translators 62

G.

Gilpin's lives of the Reformers, review of, quoted 104
Gnostic Heresy, a branch of, to affirm Christ to be God over all 27
God the Father held to be the one true God, by all Christians in every age 81
Gospel of Christ, the power of God unto salvation 88
Gough, John 102
Grellett, Stephen 112
Gurney, Joseph John 33
——————, chosen Clerk of the Committee of Appeals, 35, 48, 50, 52, 54, 55

H.

Head to the 1st chapter of St. John's gospel, by King James's translators, a comment on the text 86
Heretics, burning of, in London, not well taken by the people in 1611: the practice laid aside, and why 60—62
——— described by John Locke 104
Howard, Luke, appointed a Respondent, 3, his Letter on their behalf, his speeches in the Committee, 3, 39, 57, 83, 93, 98, 105
———— reply to his Letter 30—32
———— his speeches in the Yearly Meeting 110, 111

I, J.

James 1st, his commission to Thomas Lord Ellesmere 59, 60
————, his directions to the translators of the Scriptures 61, 62
Imprimatur rule virtually repealed 102
Interrogatories, ensnaring, put to the Appellant 37
Intolerance, inconsistent with Protestantism 105

K.

Keith, George, why disowned 12, 102
King, John, Bishop of London, a persecutor 59

L.

Lean, Joel 34, 54
Legatt, Bartholomew, burnt in Smithfield in 1611 59
Letters to the Quarterly Meeting 2, 15, 23
———— Meeting for Sufferings 3, 18, 25
Letter to Sparks Moline and Josiah Messer, 17—to Luke Howard 30
Light in the mind, what 118—122
——, internal, how to be tried 123—125
Liturgy of the Church of England, language of, for the most part Unitarian 82

Locke, John, his protest against unscriptural articles of faith, pref. xiii, xiv
————, shews who are, and who are not Heretics and Schismatics 103
————, his rendering of Rom. ix. 5. 97
London Unitarian Book Society, fundamental principles of 65—69
————, general character of the works it distributes 74—76
————, why it admits works into its catalogue, known to contain sentiments adverse to its fundamental principles 108
Lordship in matters of faith forbidden by Christ 72

M.

Mahomet, professed disciples of, not entitled to claim membership in a Christian church 11
Meeting, Yearly, rules of, for conducting Appeals, 28, 29, 18, 51, 74, 112
Meeting, Monthly, acted with great precipitation 37
Meeting for Sufferings, assume the power of suspending rules, 22. Letters to 3, 18, 25
Meeting of Representatives, &c. Committee of Appeals chosen by 33
———— Ministers and Elders, appointed Censors of the press 3
————, examples of its exercise of this power, 3—16, 19—21, 83, 84, 86—96
Monthly Meetings' Committee let out a secret 106
Mystery, the peculiar mark of false doctrines 56

N.

Newcome, Archbishop, his translation of the New Testament, the basis of an Improved Version 6

O.

Original sin, the doctrine of, Unitarians do not believe 70
———— impugns the power and goodness of God.—Rejected by the Quakers 89
Overseers, how their accusation of the Appellant ought to have been treated by the church pref. viii—x
Overseers of the translation of the Scriptures appointed by James 1st. 61

P.

Paul's speech at Athens, 67—his address to the church at Corinth, 68—his testimony to Timothy 69
Penn, William, why committed to the Tower, 58—his Sandy Foundation Shaken, design of, 5, 6, 8—10—republished by the Society of Friends, in Penn's *select* works in 1771 and in 1782, 10, 38—defence by Richard Claridge 58
Penn's Rise and Progress of the Quakers pref. x
Persecutors ill qualified to translate the Scriptures faithfully and impartially 58—62

Popish and Protestant high church nearly related 105
Power of God the Father, original and underived 91
——— the Son derived from God the Father ib.
Prejudices, powerful, excited against the Appellant among his judges 4—15
Priestcraft, infectious nature of pref. vi

Q.

Quakerism, primitive, contrasted with modern Orthodoxy and real Intolerance 5, 6
———, Remarks on 4
Quakers in every period of their history, how they have exercised the power of expulsion 12
Quarterly Meeting, never discussed the case of the Appellant, 41, 42. Decided by the authority of its Committee's report 44

R.

Reason, unassisted by revelation, unable to discover the most important religious truths 56
———, natural revelation 115
———, our judge and guide 123
——— and Scripture, unerring rules 124
Records of the Society of Friends, not open as formerly to the inspection of its members 26, 106
Respondents chosen by the Quarterly Meeting 3, 106
——— Letter from 30
——— speeches of, 34, 35, 39, 40, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 68, 81, 82, 83, 93, 98, 105, 109, 110, 111
Revelation, what, 115, always consistent 121
Rules of the Society, none that apply to the case of the Appellant 109

S.

Sabellians seem *in words* to magnify *the name* of the Son of God, but *in reality* deny his existence 89, 95
Sabellius excommunicated, for asserting Christ to be God over all 89
Sacred writers wholly silent concerning the essence of God 88, 89
Scripture, general rule for interpreting, to bring all to the standard of Christ's own doctrine 87
———, translation of *only* good, if schism and dissent are good, and why 104, 105
Servetus burnt at Geneva, at the instigation of Calvin 58
Simplicity, a distinguishing characteristic of divine truth 56
Spirit, intolerant injurious to the interests of truth and virtue 1
Spirit, Pharisaic, its effects 64, 65
Stacey, George, a Respondent 3
———, speech in the Quarterly Meeting, 16—remarks on the state of man, and his redemption by Jesus Christ 86—99

Stacey, George, his metaphysical conjectures concerning the essence of God, 88—avoids admitting in any sense whatever a distinction of persons in the Deity 89
Statute book, the possession of usurped by a Committee of the Yearly Meeting 27

T.

Trinity, the common doctrine of 20, 21, 99, 100
Translators of the New Testament chosen by James 1st, list of 61
Truth, love of, how to be known 113
Tuke, William 54, 73, 74
Tuke, Henry 85

U.

Union, mysterious, of the divine and human nature in Christ, no scriptural doctrine 87, 95
Unity of God, the supreme importance of openly asserting, inculcated by Christ 66, 67
Unitarians, why they do not believe many things in the Book of Common Prayer 70
——— receive the doctrine of Scripture 71—74

V.

Version of the Scriptures, prepared by persecutors, to be received with caution 58—62

W.

Wilkinson, John, Clerk of the Yearly Meeting, his firm and impartial conduct pref. viii
——— 51, 53, 55
———, reads the Appeal 35—47
——— 69, 73, 107, 110

INDEX

OF

TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE CITED IN THIS WORK.

	Page.
Psalm lxxxix. 19	97
—— lxxxix. 52	76
—— xcvii. 7	98
Dan. iii. 28	97
Matt. iv. 2	84
— v. 14	90
— viii. 2	ib.
— viii. 11	72
— xvi. 27	107
— xix. 14	70
— xxiii. 9, 10	72
Mark xii. 28—38	36, 65—67
— xii. 29	73
— xiv. 61	97
Luke vi. 31	14
— ix. 55	pref. xii
— x. 22	77
— xiii. 29	72
— xxii. 25, 26	ib.
John iv. 23	73
— v. 19	77
— v. 19, 26, 21, 25	91
— v. 30	92
— v. 35	90
— v. 31, 32, 37	title page
— vii. 14—17	87
— viii. 54	title page
— ix. 38, 33	90
— x. 24—36	92
— x. 30, 37, 38	ib.
— x. 30, 20	95
— xiv. 28	94
— xvii. 11	89
— xiv. 28	97
— xviii. 37	title page
— xx. 31	pref. xv
Acts ii. 22	73
— iii. 26	71
— iv. 32	89
— v. 30, 31, 29	title page
— x. 34, 35	71
— x. 25, 26	90
— x. 36	97
— xvii. 30, 31	74
— xvii. 22—31	36, 65—67

	Page.
Rom. i. 16	88
— i. 25	97
— ii. 7	71
— ii. 10	ib.
— ii. 12, 14	72
— iv. 15	70
— ix. 5	98
— ix. 5	97
— ix. 5	95
— xiv. 4	72
— xiv. 10	pref.
1 Cor. i. 24	88
—— viii. 5, 6	36, 68, 69
—— viii. 6	73
—— viii. 6	title page
—— x. 12	97
—— xi. 7	70
—— xii. 7	43
—— xv. 21, 22	73
—— xv. 24, 28	74
—— xv. 27	97
2 Cor. i. 3	ib.
—— i. 3	43
—— v. 10	71
—— xi. 31	97
Gal. vi. 4, 5	71
Eph. i. 3	97
— iii. 9	88
— iii. 19	97
Col. i. 15	76
— i. 15, 18	96
— ii. 9	ib.
1 Tim. ii. 1—5, 7—10	36, 68
—— ii. 5, 6	73
—— ii. 5	title page
Phil. ii. 5	3
Heb. xii. 2	87
James iii. 9	70
Jude 3	21
1 Peter i. 3	97
2 Peter i. 5, 10, 11	71
1 John i. 5	91
——— iii. 4	70
——— iii. 7	71
——— v. 27	74

The following Works by THOMAS FOSTER, *are sold by* R. HUNTER, *(Successor to J. Johnson), St. Paul's Church-yard.*

---

1. A VINDICATION OF SCRIPTURAL UNITARIANISM, and some other Primitive Christian Doctrines, in reply to Vindex's Examination of an Appeal to the Society of Friends. By Thomas Foster, under the Signature of Verax. 8vo. pp. 124. Price 3s.
2. A NARRATIVE OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN AMERICA, of the Society called Quakers, in the Case of Hannah Barnard, to which is prefixed, A Brief Review of the previous Transactions in Great Britain and Ireland. Price 4s.
3. CHRISTIAN UNITARIANISM VINDICATED, being a Reply to a Work by John Bevans, jun. entitled A Defence of the Christian Doctrines of the Society of Friends. 8vo. pp. 324. Price 7s. in Boards.
4. A NARRATIVE OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY CALLED QUAKERS, within the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, against Thomas Foster, for openly professing their Primitive Doctrines concerning the Unity of God. 8vo. pp. 372. Pref. pp. xl. Index pp. 16. Price 10s. in Boards.

Of whom also may be had,

5. REMARKS ON THE YEARLY MEETING EPISTLE, of the People called Quakers, for the Year 1810. From the Monthly Repository. By An Unitarian Christian, Breviloquus, Pacificus and Candidus. 8vo. Price 6d.
6. DEVOTIONAL AND DOCTRINAL EXTRACTS, FROM EPISTLES OF THE YEARLY MEETINGS IN LONDON, of the People called Quakers, from the Year 1678 to 1810. London: Printed for Cradock and Joy, Paternoster Row.
7. THE SANDY FOUNDATION SHAKEN; or those so generally received Doctrines of one God, subsisting in three distinct and separate Persons, the Impossibility of God's pardoning Sinners, without a plenary Satisfaction, the Justification of impure Persons by an imputative Righteousness, Refuted, from the Authority of Scripture Testimonies and right Reason. By William Penn, a Builder on that Foundation which cannot be moved. 8vo. Price 1s.
8. The same Work, in 12mo. Price 4d.
9. "THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY AS DELIVERED IN THE SCRIPTURES," by John Locke, last Edit. pp. 147. Price in boards, 3s. 6d, including a short account of the Life and Writings of the Author, with his celebrated "Essay for the understanding of St. Paul's Epistles, by consulting St. Paul himself."

THE

SEQUEL TO AN APPEAL

TO THE

YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS,

HELD IN LONDON, A. D. 1814.

OR,

A SUMMARY

OF

THE RESPONDENTS' REPLY

AND SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDINGS

ON

THE APPEAL OF THOMAS FOSTER

against the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex

ON HIS

EXCOMMUNICATION

FOR ASSERTING THE

UNITY, SUPREMACY, AND SOLE DEITY OF

GOD THE FATHER.

"Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?---Judge not, that ye be not judged." JESUS CHRIST.

"Who art thou that judgest another Man's servant?---With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgement; yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing by myself, yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord." PAUL.

London:

PRINTED BY RICHARD AND ARTHUR TAYLOR, SHOE LANE:

AND SOLD BY R. HUNTER, 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND BY ALL THE OTHER BOOKSELLERS IN TOWN AND COUNTRY.

1816.

TO THE

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,

with best wishes for their welfare and advancement in Christian Knowledge and the Practice of Virtue, the ensuing pages are respectfully dedicated; being the Sequel to an Appeal relative to the Confirmation of my Excommunication by the Yearly Meeting in 1814*; which, in its next year's Epistle, I observe with pleasure, impressively exhorts you to offer* "all your natural powers, *and* every intellectual attainment *to the service of the same Lord—the Almighty,*" *to whom, as it truly asserts,* "*we are indebted for* the blessing of existence, *for* the means of Redemption, *and* for that lively Hope of Immortality *which comes* by Jesus Christ." *Cordially uniting in these sound and Scriptural sentiments, and earnestly desiring your steady, open, and practical adherence thereto, I remain your sincere Friend,*

THOMAS FOSTER.

PREFACE.

It was with reluctance that I published my Appeal and Address to the Yearly Meeting, without annexing to it a Summary of the Respondents' Reply. But as they declined my repeated offer to submit the *MS.* to their inspection, I hoped the publication of that work would induce them to print it, as it was drawn up and delivered.

I annexed to one copy of my Appeal &c. a *MS.* Summary of the Respondents' Reply, as given in the following pages, *but without the Notes.* This *MS.* has been examined by a number of Friends who heard the Respondents' Reply, all of whom are of opinion that it was generally correct. Several who approved the most part of the Respondents' Reply, recommended this Summary of it to be printed, as an interesting, useful, and acceptable publication. If the Respondents, on comparing it with their Notes, should think otherwise,—however numerous or important the errors or omissions of my Summary may be,—I shall be glad to see an authentic and full Report of their Reply published. They are aware it has been described to Friends in the country, as "the most satisfactory defence and exposition of the doctrines of the Society *which any occasion had ever called forth.*"

If it be justly entitled to this high character, it

should by all means be published. And if any material injury be done it by this work, surely the Respondents will feel it incumbent upon them to vindicate its reputation, although their Reply "*may have completely answered the end for which it was drawn up*," that of confirming my excommunication. If this Summary of it cannot be justly charged with misrepresentation, or with omitting any important part of their argument, the Notes may perhaps have some claim upon their attention*."

The Respondents concluded their Reply, before the Yearly Meeting, about the time it generally adjourns, after which many of its members soon become restless, whatever be the subject under discussion. I had not proceeded far in my Rejoinder, before this disposition became very prevalent. This unsettled state of the Meeting, and

* The last application to the Respondents to enable me to exhibit their Reply "*in all its strength, and not as a mere Summary*," was as follows;

"Bromley, Feb. 13, 1816.

"Respected Friend,

"I feel reluctant to address thee *again* on any subject connected with my late Appeal to the Yearly Meeting. Yet I am not quite satisfied to risk doing any injustice to the Respondents' Reply, by publishing a Summary of it, without previously offering with your permission carefully to correct the *MS.* myself before it is sent to the Press, *by your papers*, if you will favour me with that part of them, although you have already declined inspecting the said *MS.* yourselves, and pointing out any errors in it, of which you could have just reason to complain.

"Or, I will insert in the intended Sequel to my Appeal, instead of my Summary so corrected, *if you prefer it*, as full a Report of your Reply as your papers will enable me to give. In either case, if you intrust me with them, I hereby engage to return them uninjured in a short time. And in order to obviate a possible objection on your part, to granting me the use of your *MS.*, I will just observe, that your declining it will neither prevent, nor much longer

its apparent determination not to adjourn till both parties had relinquished the right of a further hearing, I thought might possibly arise from a general conviction that the decision appealed against ought to be reversed; on account of the admitted irregularity of the proceedings, because the rules of the Discipline were never intended to be so applied, or from an apprehension of the danger of such a precedent.

Under these impressions, I waved discussing various parts of the Respondents' Reply at all, or so fully as I wished, and the Minutes I had made would easily enable me to have done. The Notes annexed to the following Summary of it are intended to supply these defects of my Rejoinder, the substance of which is given in the ensuing pages as correctly as my memory would allow. But as much of it was not committed to writing till a considerable time after the Yearly Meeting,

suspend the publication of the Sequel to my Appeal. If it should be printed from my *MS.* only, in whatever degree it may exhibit your argument imperfectly or erroneously, I trust the repeated offers made you will unequivocally evince my desire to avoid doing your Reply any injustice. Waiting your answer, I remain thy sincere Friend,

"THOMAS FOSTER."

"To Luke Howard, Tottenham."

The following is a copy of his Reply.

"Tottenham, 15th of 2d Month, 1816.

"RESPECTED FRIEND,

"Having communicated the substance of thy Letter of the day before yesterday, to three of the Friends formerly Respondents on thy Appeal to the Yearly Meeting, they unite with me in refusing, decidedly and finally, to afford thee the use of their *MS.* Reply, for the purposes of thy intended Publication. I remain respectfully thy Friend,

"LUKE HOWARD."

"To Thomas Foster, Bromley, Middlesex."

it may not be precisely what I actually delivered. Of the extent of this variation those who were present, and peruse these pages, may judge for themselves. With regard to the "*deliberate consideration*" of the case, the next day, by the members of the Meeting, I have given as fair and full an account of it as the notes and other information I was able to procure would furnish. A number of the Friends who spoke were personally unknown to the young man who took notes of the discussion, and so firmly persevered in the exercise of *an indefeasible right*.

If it exhibits the leading features of this Discussion fairly, it will enable any sound unprejudiced mind to appreciate *its genuine character*. I shall therefore make an observation or two, which this picture of the Discussion naturally suggests.

1. It is very remarkable that among so great a number of speakers in favour of confirming the judgement of the Committee of Appeals, *only one person* professed to approve all the proceedings of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting, and this declaration appeared so incredible to the sensible Friend who spoke next, that he could not believe this person meant any such thing; and he appears to have silently acquiesced in this construction of his meaning.

2. So generally were those proceedings reprobated, which I feared might become a dangerous precedent, that the most which appears to have been said in their favour, and that by *two or three Friends only*, *was*, that *rather too much censure* had been expressed by *some Friends* on the con-

duct of that Meeting: one of whom expressly declared that "he did *not* approve of *any* of their proceedings," and others appear to have been of the same opinion. It was against that conduct, and the confirmation of *those proceedings* by the Quarterly Meeting, that I appealed, as inquisitorial, arbitrary, and unjust. My judges with "*much unanimity*" admit them to have been improper and indefensible, *but confirm the decision which was founded thereon.*

This is plainly equivalent to taking the power of disownment into the hands of the Yearly Meeting, with whom its exercise is not intrusted by its own rules, but *to Monthly Meetings only;* any proceedings of which, proved under an Appeal not to be *regular* and *orderly*, should unquestionably be reversed. Objections of this nature were repeatedly urged in this case, but little attended to. It was in reality taken up and carried through by the Monthly Meeting, at the instance of a *secret junta* of Disciplinarians, *who were not its members*, and whose personal influence *insured its confirmation* by the Quarterly Meeting.

Had the decision of the Monthly Meeting been reversed by the Quarterly Meeting, the names of those "*many Friends of other Meetings,*" which are still so carefully concealed, would have been in danger of being *proclaimed.* It was *you*, the Disciplinarians of Ratcliff might have said, who incited us to take up this case; and do you now desert us, who acted not on *our own judgement*, but *on yours;* and do you expect your names to be *still concealed?*

After I had given due notice of Appeal to the

Yearly Meeting, the body to which I have no doubt the junta belonged, the "Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders," sanctioned a work for publication, which, among many other injurious imputations, holds me up in effect as a "*professed disciple of Mahomet.*" Soon after this, the said work was advertised as being so *sanctioned.* It was also recommended to the general attention of Friends, *with other approved works*, by the "Meeting for Sufferings," which *advised* two copies to be taken by each Monthly Meeting, and their advice was I doubt not respected as a Law.

These circumstances I was not permitted by the Yearly Meeting to explain, in order to remove the prejudices I had much reason to believe had been instilled into the minds of my judges. See my Appeal, p. 45—49, 51—54. How then could impartiality be expected at their hands? I, nevertheless, after some hesitation, concluded to persevere, as stated in my Appeal, &c. in the hopeless task of pleading my cause before that Assembly.

Those who may *also* peruse these pages will be competent to judge for themselves, so far as I can enable them, how far the Respondents' Reply is an answer to my Appeal and Address, or, *a mere evasion* of all the principal points at issue between us, and especially of this highly interesting question, if any thing be so appertaining to true Religion; "Whom ought we *alone to worship*, according to the commands and example of Jesus of Nazareth, our acknowledged Lord and Master?"

Since the decision of the Yearly Meeting on my Appeal, my apprehensions that it might encourage an inquisitorial and intolerant misapplication of the discipline, have been much diminished. The radical principles on which the case was taken up were so strongly censured in the Yearly Meeting, that it will I trust make Disciplinarians in future more cautious how they venture to sit in judgement in like manner on their brethren on points of faith. They would do much better to attend to the advice of an Apostle. "Hast thou faith? *Have it to thyself before God.*" But impose not thy "private interpretation" of the "Scripture" upon thy Brother. Nor tempt him if he be "weak in the faith," to engage in "doubtful disputations.—Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

The prosperity of the Society of Friends and its consequent increase in Christian Knowledge and Virtue are still interesting to me on many accounts. It has never imposed upon its members any form of worship which enjoins a recognition of more than one object of adoration. And it leaves every person who attends its Meetings for worship, to offer up the pure incense of the heart, to that Being *only* to whom each worshiper believes in his conscience this homage is justly due.

With its testimony to the universal and impartial love of God to mankind under every dispensation of his Providence, I fully concur, and especially that he "hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel of his Son.—For *God* our Saviour *will have all men to be saved* and to come to the knowledge of the truth." I also con-

cur with them fully in the utter repugnance of all war (and especially of offensive war) to the spirit and precepts of Christianity; and that it recognises no Priests, and consequently no Priestcraft: also that "there is a spirit in man," and that "the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding" to discern good from evil, virtue from vice, true doctrines from false, so far as is necessary for the salvation of every man*.

The imprimatur rule has much to my satisfaction lately become still more obsolete. The publication of Lindley Murray's "Compendium of religious Faith and Practice" sets it at open defiance. It assumes very properly, that the Author alone is accountable for any errors it may contain, and not the Society of which he is a much esteemed member. Nay, he even assigns its imperfections as the reason why he declines complying with a rule, which requires to be "invariably observed." The first section of the work consists of seven "Articles of faith; or what *we are to believe*" concerning "the being and attributes of God." Six of them † I accord with as sound,

* "On the nature of the *Conscience*, and the necessity of attention to its cultivation," see the Appendix.

† 1. There is but one living and true God, the Maker and Preserver of all things, the Source of happiness, and of every thing that is good. Deut. vi. 4. Rev. iv. 11. Ps. xxxvi. 6. Acts xvii. 28. Ps. xvi. 11. James i. 17.

2. This great Being has always existed, and he will exist for ever, and his nature is unchangeable. Ps. xc. 2. 2 Peter iii. 8. Malachi iii. 6. James i. 17.

3. He is all-powerful and glorious; He is every where present; He knows every thing, and perceives our very thoughts and desires. Matt. vi. 13. Isai. xl. 17. Prov. xv. 3. Ps. xciv. 9. xxxix. 12.

4. He is a God of truth, holiness, and justice. Rev. xv. 3. Ps. lxxxix. 34. Isai. xliii. 3. Exod. xv. 11. Gen. xviii. 25. Ps. lxxxix. 14.

definite and Scriptural; but not with the 7th, because several of the texts adduced as "proofs and illustrations from the *Holy* Scriptures" are erroneously rendered, and the rest are entirely silent concerning the existence of any "mysterious union of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit," in the "One living and true God*."

In the Yearly Meeting for 1809, when the Answers to the Fourth Query were under consideration, and much had been said on a departure from "plainness of speech, behaviour and apparel," but little or nothing on neglecting to read "the Holy Scriptures;" a proposal was made for the Meeting

5. He is a God of wisdom, love, and mercy. Ps. civ. 24. Rom. xi. 33. 1 John iv. 16. 2 Cor. i. 3. xiii. 11. Ps. cxlv. 9.

6. He is possessed of every perfection and excellence in an infinite degree. Ps. clxvii. 5. Rom. xi. 33. Job xi. 7. 1 Kings viii. 27.

* Yet the Author in his Introduction scruples not to assert that "every tenet and position in this Work is *illustrated* and *confirmed*, by *appropriate passages* taken from the Holy Scriptures; from which it will appear *that the whole is founded upon* and *warranted by Divine Revelation*." He should, therefore, making such a declaration, have been especially careful to appeal to no text *of dubious authority*. Instead of which all the texts he cites in proof of this "mysterious union," that even *seem to give it any countenance*, are notoriously "corrupted, or perverted" as they are cited by him from the received Version. From which, however, he does not scruple to deviate in quoting Matt. xxviii. 19, without one word of explanation, although the evidence in favour of this alteration is much less clear, than it is for the entire rejection of 1 John v. 7, and for a very different rendering of other texts appealed to, as Rom. ix. 5. Phil. ii. 6. and John i. 14, all of which he adopts from the received text, as "*warranted by divine Revelation*." Such tenets as these, he is aware, cannot be expected to keep their ground unless they "be aided *by early impression and the influence of habit*; and be *made* to grow with the learners' growth, and to strengthen with their strength." His notion of "some points of Scriptural Doctrine" is, that they are *unrevealed* "*revelations*, which are above the comprehension of the human intellect!" Such cannot surely be "*the revelations* of our *heavenly Father*," who knoweth how to give *good gifts* to his children!

to recommend their being publicly read in Friends' Meetings, in order to insure a better and more general acquaintance with their contents amongst its members. In reply to this the late J. G. Bevan observed, "There is not, I think, time *at present* for the Meeting to go properly into the consideration of this *important subject.*" Whether that Assembly has yet found time to take it up, or not, before I close this Preface I would *again* earnestly recommend it to all the members of the Society who may peruse these pages. Surely a practice recommended by the precepts and example of Christ, and followed by the Primitive Christian Church, however it may have been since connected with forms and ceremonies which Christ never authorized, may be revived in its genuine simplicity, *to the great advantage of those who would be his followers.*—See Preface to Narrative, p. xvii—xix.

To the candour of my readers I submit the ensuing pages, and especially my Rejoinder with the notes annexed to the Respondents' Reply, &c. I am sensible they are unworthy of the great cause I have at heart, the diffusion of the all-important doctrine, that there is only one true and living God, *the Father Almighty*, and one mediator between God and men, *the Man* Christ Jesus, whom God "in all things *made* like unto his Brethren" of the human race, "yet without sin," and who "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him—that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of *God the Father.*"

THE

SEQUEL TO AN APPEAL,

&c. &c.

YEARLY MEETING,

5th Mo. 25th, 1814.

THE Meeting met at four, soon after which the Respondents appointed by London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting; viz., George Stacey, Luke Howard, William Allen, John Eliot, Josiah Forster, and Richard Bowman, being called upon by John Wilkinson, the Clerk, or rather Chairman under that name, Josiah Forster rose on their behalf, and addressed the Meeting to the following effect:—

A large proportion of the Appellant's Address to the Meeting yesterday was irrelevant matter irregularly introduced, and especially that part of it which consisted of the sentiments of individuals. Not that I am prepared to admit the justice of his strictures on them, or that those sentiments are either unsound or unscriptural*. But the Respondents are unitedly of the judgement that they should ill discharge their duty, or pay

* For "the sentiments" here alluded to, see my Appeal, pp. 83—98, noticing how fully those sentiments had been sanctioned by the Society; and then let the reader weigh the validity of the Respondent's excuses for passing them over as "irrelevant" and unworthy the attention of the Meeting.

proper respect to the dignity of the Meeting, by following the Appellant in the devious course he thought proper to take.

In the history of the Society, cases at all like the present have been of very rare occurrence. By far the most usual application of the Discipline has been to cases of immorality, or for an actual breach of express rules of the Society; very seldom to difference of opinion on points of faith or worship. With regard to these, as it is impracticable to provide positive rules which will apply to every case, a discretionary power is necessary to be vested in Meetings for Discipline: and this power may be safely lodged in their hands, subject to the important privilege of Appeal, which by our rules is secured to every individual who may think himself aggrieved by the judgement of any Meeting*.

The Yearly Meeting, as early as the year 1703, was sensible of the necessity of intrusting such a discretionary power with inferior Meetings, as the minute in the Book

* Such cases as the present have indeed been of very rare occurrence in the history of the Society. Its discipline was never intended by its founders to be so applied. See Preface to Appeal, pp. ix. x.

Of all the powers ever exercised by Ecclesiastics, that for which the Respondents contend, "a discretionary power," is by far the most dangerous. And their pleas for the safety and supposed necessity for its exercise are alike delusive:—the necessity for exercising such a power they inferred from the impossibility of providing rules, that is, articles of faith, on which the Church can agree. The just inference from this admission surely is, that the rights of private judgement should *at least* be respected within those limits on which even the rulers of the Church cannot unite.

The safety of vesting such powers in Meetings for Discipline they deduced from the manner in which the right of Appeal is secured to every individual. Of the real value of this right in the Society of Friends, perhaps few persons were more competent to form a true estimate than the late Job Scott, a minister from America, highly and deservedly esteemed. His opinion was, that "no private individual had a fair probability of succeeding in an appeal," from the "great prepossession" among its members "in every quarter" in favour of the decision of any Meeting for Discipline, however small or weak.

of Extracts of that year will show. It is as follows:—"Our Monthly and Quarterly Meetings being set up by the power and in the wisdom of God, which is the authority of those Meetings, all Friends are tenderly desired and advised carefully to keep to, and in that authority; and therein manage all the business and affairs of the said Meetings, in discharge of their duty to God and his Church; and not expect or depend upon this Meeting for particular direction from time to time, how they shall proceed in the management of the concerns of those Meetings, relating to truth's testimony and service; but wait for, and depend upon, the power and wisdom of God for counsel and direction, in such matters and cases as may come before them."

The Monthly and Quarterly Meetings appealed against in this case, have acted to the best of their judgement, as the minute just read advises.

Every religious or other Society must have some rules for its government. The Society of Friends accordingly holds certain doctrinal articles to be necessary or fundamental principles. It requires its members to profess and receive these, not as being intolerant, which we disclaim, but because their maintenance is necessary for the protection of the Society. When any of its members are known to associate with persons of other Societies, for the promotion of opposite principles, it becomes necessary to notice such cases.

In the application of these principles to particular cases, the Society of Friends possesses a great advantage, as by its rules the collective sense of its members may be taken upon them. The Appellant admitted this in his Address to the Quarterly Meeting. [See his Narrative, pp. 257, 258.]

At the same time we hold that charity to those who differ however widely from us, is necessary to be maintained. The Quarterly Meeting whose decision we are appointed to defend, is utterly adverse to a spirit of in-

tolerance, and on its behalf we disclaim the imputation*.

The Society requires from its members no subscrip-

* The Respondents disclaim "being intolerant." And although they were appointed to defend an excommunication for the exercise of the rights of private judgement, and a refusal to receive *unscriptural articles of faith*, they tell us their employers are also utterly adverse to a spirit of intolerance, and gravely disclaim the imputation on their behalf. Can any inconsistency be more palpable than this?

A minute of the Yearly Meeting in 1796 exhibits a curious instance of the insinuating encroaching nature of Church-authority. It was made because a difference of opinion had arisen among the active disciplinarians, whether a minute of 1706 simply *authorized* disownment for paying Tithes, or *enjoined* it in all cases as necessary? Many Friends were of the former opinion, the minute recommending Monthly Meetings to act in such cases, as to disownment or otherwise, "as in the *holy counsel* and *wisdom of God* they *shall be directed*." And so tolerant did the Society become under this discretionary power on the side of forbearance, where they believed the wisdom of God did not require them to act otherwise, that disownments on this account became very rare.

I was informed in an early part of my life, I expect on good authority, that the Monthly Meeting of Gracechurch Street (of which the late J. G. Bevan, the framer of this minute, was a distinguished member) once officially stated in the answer to the Query on this subject, that *a majority of its members* were in the practice of paying "Tithes, or those called Church-rates." By the minute of 1796 no such toleration towards those who can neither see the use, *propriety* or *justice* of refusing to pay such legal demands upon them, is to be any longer allowed. They are pronounced by this minute to be "*irreclaimable delinquents*," and their disownment is *expressly enjoined*. And not contented with putting this modern construction upon an ancient minute relating only to the payment of Tithes, the same injunction to proceed to disownment is extended to all other cases of *dealing* where the parties "persist in rejecting the admonition of their brethren." Meetings are no longer permitted as heretofore to act as they may suppose to be conformable to "the holy counsel and wisdom of God," lest they should err on the side of toleration and charity. This latter minute presumes in effect to declare what this wisdom shall in all such cases of dealing *invariably direct*. Its concluding language is "No such exemption from *the invariable issue of our dealings* with irreclaimable delinquents," is considered by this meeting to be *allowed* by the said minute."—Book of Extracts, 2d edit. p. 194.

tion to articles of faith. It would not be in its judgement compatible with the preservation of peace to insist on such a bond of union. It rather recommends a practical obedience to the dictates of the Spirit; and its members are not, generally speaking, so much engaged in attending to matters of doctrine, as persons of other persuasions*.

The proceedings against the Appellant might not be altogether regular; but they were not so irregular as to be vitiated on that plea, if the principal allegations against him are fully established. The particular circumstances of the Monthly Meeting should be considered on the one hand, and on the other the unfavourable representation of its proceedings in an anonymous Pamphlet entitled "A Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism, by William Penn; with a Modern Sketch of Reputed Orthodoxy and Real Intolerance by Ratcliff Monthly Meeting." Its members disclaim the charge of intolerance, or having been actuated by any animosity towards the Appellant.

This Pamphlet was published in 1812, about the time of the Yearly Meeting. And near the same time last year the Appellant published a work entitled "A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Society called Quakers within the Quarterly Meeting for London and Middlesex, against Thomas Foster, for openly professing their Primitive Doctrines concerning the Unity of God†." The Respondents agree that the Lord our

* I believe with the Respondents, that the members of the Society of Friends "are not, generally speaking, so much engaged in attending to matters of doctrine, as persons of other persuasions," and therefore that they are less acquainted with the simple and sublime doctrines of Christianity as they are laid down in the Scriptures, than those are who pay more attention to these subjects. At the same time they are probably *much more liable than others* to be carried away from the sober path of reason and revelation *by delusive notions of inspiration.*

† The title of my Narrative describes the *ostensible* cause of the proceedings against me as correctly as with a due regard to brevity was in my power. The Respondents were perhaps better acquainted

God is one Lord; but they deny the justice of this title, and cannot allow the charge it contains, that the proceedings against the Appellant were for openly professing the primitive doctrines of the Society concerning the Unity of God.

Such an *ex parte* statement should not have been made while an Appeal was pending; for although the rule of 1794 only prohibits printing an Appeal, it was equally intended to forbid, under the like penalty, printing any thing relating to a case while the same was pending. The Appellant has availed himself of the letter of this rule to appeal to the Society and to the public through the medium of the press; and the members of the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings have felt themselves much aggrieved by the said publications, and particularly as they did not feel themselves at liberty to publish any reply to them while the case was pending, the Appellant having given due notice of Appeal*.

I would now call the attention of the Meeting to the proceedings in this case. In the 8th month 1811, an Overseer called on the Appellant in consequence of his having given away some printed Remarks on the Yearly Meeting Epistle for 1810, and his being a member of the London Unitarian Book Society. The professed

than I am with the *real ground* of those proceedings. Whether the title be just, and the charge it contains be well founded, depends not on their or my assertion, but on historical evidence concerning the faith of our forefathers. To this we have both appealed; and the question is, which of us has done so *most conclusively*.

* The restraint under which the Respondents and others felt themselves so much aggrieved, not to publish any reply to my Narrative &c. while the case was pending, has now been long removed, without their availing themselves of it. How far this consideration really operated during its supposed continuance, let the sanction and publicity given by the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders, and the Meeting for Sufferings, to a work entitled "Remarks suggested by the Perusal of a Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism, &c., by Thomas Prichard," bear witness. See Appeal, pp. 3—16, and 18—21.

objects of this association are stated in the preface to its Book of Rules to be, to promote "the right principles of religion;" and therefore it is not, as the Appellant has endeavoured to prove, a mere Book Society. He was afterwards visited by two Overseers on the same grounds, who reported the case to the Monthly Meeting, on which a Committee of four Friends was appointed to visit him. The Minute of their appointment related to those two subjects only; and whether the objections the Appellant made to this minute being drawn up in indefinite terms be well founded or not is of little consequence*. [See his Narrative, pp. 35, 36, 58, 131, 261, 262.]†

The Committee are alleged not to have paid due attention to the subjects referred to them [Ibid. pp. 62—64], and to have questioned the Appellant on matters foreign to the objects of their appointment [Ibid. 84—88, 131—134, 264—266]. As to their having adduced passages of Scripture in their conferences with the Appellant, we are not now discussing whether they were apposite, or not: they were such as they deemed pertinent to the occasion.

As to questioning the Appellant, and in some other respects, we admit that the proceedings do not appear on the face of the Meeting's records such as we could have wished‡.

* The commencement of the proceedings against me is fairly and candidly stated; but how the Respondents could think it of "little consequence" whether the charges entered upon the Meeting's records were definite, or indefinite, I am quite at a loss to imagine. When an accused person is publicly recorded as a delinquent, surely justice imperiously requires that his offence should be correctly stated. This the Respondents knew was urged, nay demanded by me, but refused by my accusers.

† This and similar references to my Narrative are intended to show the parts to which I suppose the Respondents alluded, which I may in some instances have mistaken.

‡ If the disciplinary proceedings in my case need such apologies as these and those which follow, how the Respondents, admitting this, could consider them fit to be confirmed I cannot understand. Yet did they not hesitate to hold them up in the lump as founded in "the power and wisdom of God."

The Appellant alleges that the Monthly Meeting came to a hasty decision on his case. It might have been as well had more opportunity been allowed; but it should be recollected that he had not only imbibed, but aided in propagating the erroneous opinions imputed to him: that private labour was first extended, and that his sentiments upon these subjects were not of recent adoption, but, to use his own expressions, had grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength. And therefore no attempts to bring about a change in his opinions were likely to succeed *. As to his allegation that there is a fresh charge in the Testimony of Denial, [Narrative, pp. 106, 107, 131, 329],—the Report of the Committee had stated that he was "a member of the Unitarian Society" [Ibid. p. 111]: and in saying that "they publicly avow their disbelief of the eternal divinity of Jesus Christ our Lord," the Committee expressed themselves, *as they thought, correctly.* We leave the Yearly Meeting to judge whether the Preface to the Book of Rules of which I have already spoken, warrants what is said in the Testimony of Denial [Ibid. pp. 112—115. 117—119 †].

When an Appeal against this decision was presented to the Quarterly Meeting, the same was referred to a Committee chosen in the usual manner. On meeting the parties, and the Appeal being read, the Respondents presented a printed Pamphlet, containing a copy of the Minutes of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting respecting Thomas Foster, with explanatory notes, [Ibid. pp. 108—114]. On considering this publication, the Committee determined to apply to the Quarterly Meeting for advice

* A hasty decision is here defended because the sentiments imputed to me as erroneous were imbibed in early life, and that, too, by the perusal of the Scriptures, and the writings of approved authors in the Society of Friends. See Narrative, p. 12.

† Nothing can warrant an assertion which is not true, although the Committee in making it may have "expressed themselves, as they thought, correctly."

how to act under such circumstances [Ibid. pp. 136—146]. And I have yet to learn that a delegated body can be justly censured for applying to the body delegating for instructions.

Such of the Committee as are Respondents have heard with surprise a charge of partiality. The parties were to the best of our judgement fairly and fully heard. The proceedings of the Quarterly Meeting were conducted agreeably to the rules of the discipline. It is not for us to defend the sentiments supposed to have been expressed by individuals during the discussion of the case in the Quarterly Meeting, but its recorded judgement, which was clearly the sense of the Meeting*.

The ground on which the disownment took place, and was confirmed by the Quarterly Meeting, was, that the Appellant had imbibed and aided in propagating sentiments contrary to the principles of the Society, which he had evinced by becoming a member of the London Unitarian Book Society, by publications under the signature of "Verax," and by aiding in the circulation of a printed paper entitled "Remarks on the Yearly Meeting Epistle for 1810."

Of these charges, the Respondents deem the first of itself sufficient to justify disownment†. In the discussion of this case before the Quarterly Meeting, an ex-

* The true character of this application for instructions the Respondents kept out of sight. See the 10th Sec. of my Appeal, p. 38, and the note on it, p. 39. Although the Respondents shrink from defending the opinions expressed by individuals while acting as my judges in the Quarterly Meeting, they contend that "its recorded judgement was *clearly* the sense of the Meeting." But how this was ascertained does not appear. See the yet uncontroverted report of this discussion in my Narrative, pp. 344—365.

† The Respondents seem to give up the other charges as untenable, but say my becoming a member of the London Unitarian Book Society is of itself sufficient to justify disownment. And yet they professed to believe [p. 5, 6.] "that the Lord our God *is one Lord*," which is the great tenet by which that association is distinguished.

tract was adduced by the Respondents for the Monthly Meeting, from a work of the Appellant's respecting the doctrine of Divine Influence on the human mind, for the purpose of charging him with rejecting this doctrine. The Appellant complains that no accusation on this subject was ever mentioned to him till the fourth sitting of the Quarterly Meeting's Committee. [Narrative, pp. 200 — 205]. This, we understand, arose from the professed determination of the Appellant rather to leave the room than to listen to fresh accusations from the Monthly Meeting's Committee [Ibid. pp. 62, 63].* And though the Appellant had been a member of the London Unitarian Book Society for more than seven years, it was not known to the Overseers till a few days before he was visited [Ibid. p. 27]. In the first paragraph of the preface to its book of rules, the great importance of the objects which its members associate to promote, is stated in general terms. In the next its members are described as "endeavouring to clear the Christian system from all foreign incumbrances—by representing the doctrines of revelation in their primitive simplicity." *Here let us pause*, and consider whether this is not a Society for propagating certain religious doctrines, and not a mere Book Society? In the third paragraph its fundamental principles are laid down. In the fourth it is said: "While, therefore, many well-meaning persons are propagating with zeal, opinions which the members of this Society judge to be unscriptural and idolatrous, they think it their duty to oppose the further progress of such pernicious errors, and publicly to avow their firm attachment to the doctrine of the Unity of God, of his unrivalled and undivided authority and dominion; and their belief that Jesus Christ, the most distinguished of

* This only shows that the Committee of the Monthly Meeting confessed to the Respondents that they meant to push their inquisitorial system of questioning still further than they did, or attempted, and to extend it to a greater variety of subjects, if I had not decidedly refused to answer their ensnaring interrogatories.

the prophets, is the creature and messenger of God, and not his equal, nor his vicegerent, in the formation and government of the world, nor copartner with him in divine honours." After this exposition of their belief, it goes on thus: "And they are desirous to try the experiment, whether the cause of true religion and virtue may not be most effectually promoted, upon proper Unitarian principles; and whether the plain unadulterated truths of Christianity, when fairly taught and inculcated, be not of themselves sufficient to form the minds of those who sincerely embrace them, to that true dignity and excellence to which the Gospel was intended to elevate them."

Every person, therefore, becoming a member of this Society must at least be accountable for all that the preface to its book of rules contains. Or if any member approved a part only, he should either withdraw, or by some other act publicly declare that he did not approve the whole *.

It is easy to show what are the leading doctrines of this Society, as they are not obscurely stated in this preface. Our Lord Jesus Christ is declared to be a Prophet; and its members would consider it idolatrous to offer him religious worship. The first work in the annexed catalogue is called "The New Testament in an improved Version, upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome's new Translation, with a corrected text and notes critical and explanatory. Published by a Society for promoting Christian knowledge and the practice of virtue by the distribution of Books †."

* The Respondents should have said that every member of this Book Society must at least be accountable for its fundamental principles, which they knew even my accusers professed to approve, and that I had publicly declared I did not approve the whole which this preface contains. See pp. 74—76 of my Appeal.

† "In this preface," say the Respondents, "our Lord Jesus Christ is declared to be a Prophet." No doubt he is. And it is equally a leading doctrine of this Society, and of the New Testament, that he, *the man Christ Jesus*, was not only the greatest and most distinguished of the Prophets, but the one Mediator between

In the introduction to this work it is said, "In the year 1791 a Society was formed in London, the professed design of which was to promote religious knowledge and the practice of virtue by the distribution of books. Of this Society, from its first origin, it has always been a principal object to publish an Improved Version of the Holy Scriptures, and particularly of the New Testament." The obstacles which impeded this design are next stated; after which the Editors add, "The design, however, of publishing an Improved Version of the New Testament was never totally abandoned: and it was resumed with great unanimity and spirit at the annual meeting of the London Society, in April 1806," after the Appellant was become one of its members*.

A few extracts from the notes to this New Version will be sufficient to show the Meeting the general complexion of this work. Of these notes the Respondents have selected the following examples. The first relates

God and men. Did the Respondents mean to question this? But "its members," say the Respondents, "would consider it idolatrous to offer him religious worship." Some of them may; but others doubt or deny the propriety of terming the worship even of Trinitarians idolatrous, because, however unscriptural or inconsistent the language used in their devotions sometimes may be, they would charitably suppose it is intended to be offered not to a Prophet, however highly distinguished, but to the God and Father of that Prophet.

* Could the Respondents have forgotten that the late Dr. Fothergill and many other respectable Friends were equally anxious to have an Improved Version of the New Testament published, and that Purver's new translation of the Scriptures was printed under the general auspices of the Society of Friends in 1764? See my Narrative, p. 207.

The design cannot in itself surely be criminal, if the received Version contains, as Barclay asserted it did, both "corrupted and perverted passages." But this design of publishing an *improved* Version, say the Respondents, was resumed by this Book Society with great unanimity and spirit after the Appellant became one of its members. Perhaps so. But no part of the credit or discredit of its execution belongs to him. He was not at all qualified to engage in the arduous and commendable undertaking.

to Matt. xviii. 20, where Christ is recorded to have said, " For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." When I have read the note on this text, the Meeting will judge how far it accords with the well-known sense of the Society of Friends on the solemn import of this text. It is as follows: " This promise, and those in the two preceding verses, are to be understood as limited to the apostolic age, and, perhaps, to the apostles themselves. To be gathered together in the name of Christ, is to assemble as his disciples, and as acting under his authority. And he was in the midst of them, either, by his personal presence, agreeably to his promise, Matt. xxviii. 20; or, by a spiritual presence, similar to the gift occasionally conferred upon the apostles, of knowing things which passed in places where they were not actually present, 1 Cor. v. 3, 4; or, lastly, by that authority which he had delegated, and by the powers which he had communicated to them to perform miracles in his name. See Pearce and Newcome*."

The next note in this New Version to which we would call the attention of the Meeting is that on Matt. xxviii. 20; in which Jesus, after declaring " All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth," says, according to the received text, "and lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." Instead of which, in this new version the text is rendered, *as we think erroneously*, "and lo, I am with you always, to the end of the age." To which this note is annexed: "To the end of the age, *i. e.* to the end of the Jewish

* Those who wish to discover the true meaning of the text here spoken of, Matt. xviii. 20, will do well carefully to mark its connexion not only with the two preceding verses, but with the context at large, which relates to the proper mode of endeavouring to restore love and friendship among fellow Christians after the commission of "personal and private injuries." William Penn has plainly shown this. Works, vol. 1. p. 780.

dispensation; till the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple: soon after which miraculous powers were withdrawn, and no *personal* appearances of Jesus Christ are recorded. See Bishop Pearce, Wakefield, &c. Now we ask the Yearly Meeting if they believe that this was the doctrine which George Fox preached?*

On John v. 4.—*For at a certain season an angel went down into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever* therefore *went in first, after the troubling of the water, was made well, whatever disease he had*—the following note is given: "The words in Italics [those above] are wanting in the Vatican and Ephrem manuscripts, and the fourth verse is omitted in the Cambridge MS. In others they are marked as doubtful, and are probably spurious. See Griesbach. It might possibly be a small medicinal spring, which flowed more copiously at some times than at others, and might flow into a bath or basin capable of receiving only one person at a time. It is not mentioned by Josephus. 'The sanative quality of the waters might, in popular estimation, be extended and magnified.' See Newcome. The passage is rejected as spurious by Semler, Michaelis, and Marsh.

* Whether "this was" or was not "the doctrine that George Fox preached" concerning the import of Matt. xxviii. 20, is of little consequence. He might as well have mistaken its true meaning as any other person. Did the Respondents intend by the earnest manner of putting this question to the Yearly Meeting, to imply that George Fox was an infallible expositor of Scripture? Or to insinuate the divinity of his mission as a Prophet?

However this may be, it manifestly appears by the words of the text that this promise related only to "the eleven disciples." Newcome was therefore well warranted in rejecting the common rendering of this text, and in giving the most usual and applicable meaning of the Greek word αἰωνος. In Hill's Lexicon, ΑΙΩΝ, ῶνος, ὁ, is rendered, 1st, *ævum* [age]; 2d, *mundus* [world]; and 3dly, *sæculum*, nearly synonymous with *ævum*. As the question solely depended upon the proper translation of a Greek word, as used in this text, I confess it surprised me not a little to hear a professed Greek scholar appeal to the authority of George Fox, or the doctrine he preached!

See Marsh's Michaelis, vol. i. p. 293, 507; vol. ii. p. 732."*

Perhaps we need not adduce more extracts: the Meeting will perceive from those we have selected, the impropriety of a member of our Society encouraging the circulation of such a work.

As the Appellant has insisted much upon the sentiments of William Penn being similar to those he is charged with holding, I shall cite a few passages to show how widely they differ. In the Life of Thomas Ellwood, p. 443, a work of George Keith's called "The Deism of William Penn and his Brethren destructive to the Christian Religion exposed," &c., is mentioned, vindicating whom, Thomas Ellwood says [p. 451], "Yet he himself (George Keith) well knows, that neither he, nor William Penn, nor any of the Quakers ever were Deists; ever did deny, disown, or disbelieve the coming, incarnation, sufferings, and death of Christ, *as man outwardly in the flesh*, his resurrection, ascension, and mediatorship; and he himself has undesignedly acquitted William Penn from his present charge of Deism by a story he told in his first Narrative, p. 38: that upon some urging him to give an instance of one English Quaker that he ever heard pray to Christ, William Penn being present, said, "I am an Englishman, and a Quaker, and I own I have oft prayed to Christ Jesus; even him that was crucified."

* On what ground the Respondents objected to this note, or to printing the text to which it relates, John v. 4, in Italics, they did not explain. If they could have shown it was in the MSS. wherein it is said to be wanting, or that the purport of it is mentioned by Josephus, or that it was not "rejected as spurious" by Semler, Michaelis, and Marsh, as this note says it was, but only by the Editors of this Version and by the Appellant, there might have been some pertinency in adducing it. As it is, I can perceive none; unless telling the truth be a crime. Yet from this and the two preceding notes above mentioned the Respondents scrupled not to assert that "the Meeting will perceive the impropriety of a member of the Society encouraging the circulation of such a work."

[This he says was in 1678, which was five years after that book was published from which he attempts to prove him a Deist; that is, "a denyer of the man Christ Jesus, who was crucified."]*

We would now request the Meeting's attention to a note in what is called an Improved Version of the New Testament, on the words of our Lord Jesus recorded John xvii. 5, as part of his solemn prayer a short time before his crucifixion: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thyself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." The note on this passage I will now read: "Or, as Mr. Wakefield renders it, 'with that glory, thine own glory, which I had before the world was.' The glory which is the object of our Lord's petition is that glory of which he speaks, ver. 22; the glory of instructing and converting mankind, verses 8, 14. This glory he had given to his apostles, ver. 22; that is, he intended it for them. The same glory the Father had given to him: that is, had reserved it for him, and purposed to bestow it upon him. He had it therefore with the Father before the world was, that is, in the Father's purpose and decree. In the language of the Scriptures, what God determines to bring to pass is represented as actually accomplished. Thus, the dead are represented as living, Luke xx. 36, 37, 38. Believers are spoken of as already glorified, Rom. viii. 29, 30. Things that are not, are called as though they were, Rom. iv. 17. And in ver. 12. of this chapter, Judas is said to be destroyed, though he was then living, and actually bargaining with the priests and rulers to betray his mas-

* If the evidence of George Keith in this case be worthy of credit, it may show that William Penn was sometimes inconsistent with himself. But it is not to compare those known doctrines in his works on which I have insisted as being those of the Society, or such as they tolerated the open profession of, with those I am charged with holding. This the Respondents, had they been inclined to meet the question fairly, should have done; but this they wholly evaded for reasons best known to themselves.

ter. See also ver. 10. Eph. i. 4; 2 Tim. i. 9; Rev. xiii. 8; Heb. x. 34; Eph. i. 4; 2 Tim. i. 9; Rev. xiii. 8; Heb. x. 34."

On the petition in the 24th verse, "Father, I desire that those also whom thou hast given me, may be with me where I am," this note is given: "'Shall be,' N. but in the original it is 'I am.' And through the whole of this excellent prayer, that is continually spoken of as present, or past, which was then future, and had no existence but in the divine decree*."

In order to show how far William Penn was from approving such a construction of these texts, I shall adduce a passage from a chapter in "The Spirit of Truth vindicated," which he entitled "Scripture Socinianized," because that chapter was intended by him to point out the perversions of Scripture by one of his opponents, who speaking of the above text had said, "It is manifest that Jesus prayed now to be glorified with the glory wherewith he was not then glorified; but God was glorious before the world was, therefore Jesus intended by the glory he had with the Father before the world was, the glory he had given him *in decree* before the

* The Respondents did not examine any of the Texts referred to in the preceding notes, in support of the Editors' construction of John xvii. 5. Some of them are so applicable and conclusive, that it would be difficult, after carefully reviewing them, to resist the evidence they afford, that in the language of the Scriptures what God determines to bring to pass is *frequently* represented as actually accomplished. Whether such be the true import of any particular text, let every reader judge for himself.

The long quotation that follows only proves what I knew before, that William Penn held the Arian notion of the pre-existence of Christ, which many Unitarians of eminence did also, indeed most of those who received the narratives in Matthew and Luke, of Mary's miraculous conception of her *first-born* Son, as authentic parts of the Gospel according to those Evangelists. Nor have I ever denied that either of those tenets was generally professed by the Society, although I believe neither of them was much insisted upon till of late years, and especially as a requisite condition of religious communion.

world was." In reply to this Socinian construction of the text, Penn says, "The *clinch* is foolish, and his consequence false and pernicious. For what if Christ was not then glorified? must it therefore follow that he was not in being, much less not glorified, before the world was?

"Can he be so great a stranger to the Apostle's doctrine, delivered in the Epistle to the Philippians? where we find him first *equal with God*, as being in his very form, or essence; next making himself of no reputation; then appearing in the fashion or likeness of men; and lastly, that he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross—which shows that he was in an exalted and glorified estate before he humbled himself, else how was he humbled? And it is a piece of sacrilege and ingratitude, I almost tremble to think on, that because he was pleased to descend in the likeness of men, in order to the salvation of mankind....he should unworthily rob him of all pre-existence in the form of God, whilst he himself thought it no robbery to be equal with God. So that though in his humble estate and fashion of a man he could not properly be said to be glorified, and therefore prayed to be so, yet it is no right consequence that therefore he never was before.

"For that would be to say, because an earthly prince may for a certain time debase himself, and take upon him the condition of an inferior person, for some great benefit that he thereby designs to do his country, if after having effected it, he desires to be received again into that glory and splendour he enjoyed before, that therefore he never had any before, only in decree: if this would be both false and absurd, the other is much more.

"This is the great mystery [or error] of the Socinians indeed the rock on which they split; they do not distinguish betwixt the form of God and likeness of men; that which came into the world to do the will of God, and the body he took in which to perform it." Vol. ii.

p. 136. [See also the Appellant's Narrative, pp. 193, 194.]

The next note in this new Version to which we would call the Meeting's attention is that on the four first verses of the Epistle to the Romans. To exhibit its import and tendency more fully, I will first read the text, and then the Editors' note. "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle separated to the Gospel of God, (which he had promised before by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures,) even the Gospel concerning his Son, who was born of the race of David, according to the flesh, *but* proved *to be* the Son of God by power, according to the holy spirit, through his resurrection from the dead; the Gospel, I say, concerning Jesus Christ our Lord." The note on this text says, "The Apostle could not mean by this phraseology and the antithesis which he here uses, to assert or countenance the strange and unintelligible notion of two natures in Christ, one the human nature, by which he was the descendant of David, the other a divine nature, by which he was the Son of God. The sense of the passage is plainly this; that Christ by natural descent was of the posterity of David; but that in a figurative sense, by designation of the holy spirit at his baptism, he was the son of God: or the promised Messiah, which was further proved by the extraordinary exertion of divine energy in raising him from the dead. See Mr. Lindsey's Second Address to the Students of the Two Universities, p. 276. Christ is called the Son of God for two reasons: First, because this title is equivalent to that of Messiah, and was so understood by the Jews, John i. 50. Thou art the son of God, thou art the king of Israel. Compare Mark i. 1; Luke iv. 41; xxii. 67, 70. Secondly, he is called a son of God as having been raised from the dead to an immortal life. In this sense Christ is called the first-born, having been the first human being who was put into possession of this glorious inheritance. Col. i. 15, 18; Heb. i. 6; Rev. i. 5. All believers, as

heirs of the same inheritance, are also sons of God. John i. 12; Rom. viii. 14—17; 1 John iii. 2. Hence they are said to be brethren of Christ and co-heirs with him; and he is the first-born among many brethren. Rom. viii. 29. These are the only senses in which the title, Son of God, is applied to Christ in the genuine apostolical writings."

After reading the above note, Luke Howard observed: The Meeting will remember the Appellant's gloss on a text of Scripture, [John x. 36,] which I mentioned yesterday as *a false gloss*, the dangerous tendency of which it was necessary immediately to point out. I would now only add, that it is perfectly consistent with the tenor of the note which has just been read*. The Meeting should also be informed that the Editors of this Version of the New Testament have had some very important parts of the first chapters of Matthew and Luke printed in Italics, for the purpose of holding them up as of "*doubtful authority*," and yet they are acknowledged to be "found in all the MSS. and Versions which are now extant." If suspicion, said Josiah Forster, is thus to be thrown upon any passage of the New Testament which happens not to accord with the preconceived opinions of every new Translator, there is no saying how much of the sacred Volume may be brought into discredit as being of doubtful authority. To the first verse of Matthew this note is affixed:—"Epiphanius says that Cerinthus and Carpocrates, who used the gospel of the Ebionites, which was probably the

* The Respondents should have given their ideas about the doctrine of "two natures in Christ," as they seem to have called the Meeting's attention to this note principally because it asserts that the Apostle could not mean by the four first verses of the Epistle to the Romans to countenance that strange and unintelligible notion. Nor did they attempt to give any other explanation of even one of the Texts referred to in the note, in support of the Editors' conclusion. They were, however, not far out in describing my construction of John x. 36, the day before, as "perfectly consistent with the tenor of the above note."

original gospel of Matthew, written in the Hebrew language for the use of the Jewish believers, argued from the genealogy at the beginning of the gospel, that Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary; but that the Ebionites had taken away even the genealogy, beginning their gospel with these words: "And it came to pass in the days of Herod the king, &c." See Epiph. Hæres. 30. N. 13. Jones on the Canon, vol. i. pt. 2. ch. 25. It is probable, therefore, that the first sixteen verses of this chapter are genuine; and that they were found at least in the copies of Cerinthus and Carpocrates. And, indeed, it can hardly be supposed that an author writing for the instruction of Hebrew christians, would have omitted to trace the descent of Christ from Abraham and David, upon which they justly laid so great a stress. Archbishop Newcome adds the names in v. 8. from 1 Chron. iii. 11, 12. And he suspects v. 17 to have been a marginal note anciently taken into the text. See the annotations to his Harmony, § 9. The eighteenth verse begins a new story, which continues to the end of the second chapter. This could not have been written by the author of the genealogy, for it contradicts his design, which was to prove that Jesus, being the son of Joseph, was the descendant of Abraham and David, whereas the design of this narrative is to show that Joseph, the reputed father of Jesus, was not his real father. This account therefore of the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ must have been wanting in the copies of Cerinthus and Carpocrates as well as in those of the Ebionites: and if the genealogy be genuine, this narrative must be spurious." The Editors say in a note, "The remainder of this chapter, and the whole of the second, are printed in Italics, as an intimation that they are of doubtful authority. They are indeed to be found in all the manuscripts and versions which are now extant; but from the testimony of Epiphanius and Jerome we are assured that they were wanting in the copies used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, that is, by the ancient Hebrew

Christians; for whose instruction, probably, this gospel was originally written; and to whom the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ could not have been unacceptable, if it had been found in the genuine narrative. Nor would it at all have militated against the doctrine of the proper humanity of Christ, which was universally held by the Jewish Christians, it being a fact analogous to the miraculous birth of Isaac, Samuel, and other eminent persons of the Hebrew nation. If it be true, as Luke relates, chap. iii. 23. that Jesus was entering upon his thirtieth year (see Wakefield's Translation) in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, he must have been born two years at least after the death of Herod, a circumstance which alone invalidates the whole story. See Lardner's Works, vol. i. p. 432. It is indeed highly improbable that no notice should have been taken of these extraordinary events by any contemporary writer, that no expectation should have been excited by them, and that no allusion should have been made to them in any other passage of the sacred writings. Some of the facts have a fabulous appearance, and the reasoning from the prophecies of the Old Testament is inconclusive. Also, if this account be true, the proper name of Jesus, according to the uniform custom of the Jews, would have been Jesus of Bethlehem, not Jesus of Nazareth. Our Lord in the gospels is repeatedly spoken of as the son of Joseph, without any intimation on the part of the historian that this language is incorrect. See Matt. xiii. 55. Luke iv. 23. John i. 45. vi. 42. The account of the miraculous conception of Jesus was probably the fiction of some early gentile convert, who hoped, by elevating the dignity of the Founder, to abate the popular prejudice against the sect. See upon this subject, Dr. Priestley's History of Early Opinions, vol. iv. b. iii. c. 20; Pope on the Miraculous Conception; Dr. Williams's Free Enquiry; Dr. Bell's Arguments for the Authenticity of the Narratives of Matthew and Luke, and Dr. Williams's Remarks; Dr. Campbell and

Dr. Newcome's Notes upon the text; Mr. Evanson's Dissonance, chap. i. sect. 3. chap. iii. sect. 2; Jones's Developement of Events, vol. i. p. 365 &c.*" In a note

* The notes on the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, which the Respondents read, are far from supporting the insinuation thrown out by them, that "some very important parts" of those chapters were printed in Italics because they did not accord with the preconceived opinions of the translator, and that any passage of the New Testament might have suspicion thrown upon it in like manner." Now the fact is, that no other passage "to be found in all the MSS. and Versions now extant" has ever been thought liable to *similar* objections. And these objections are founded not on the preconceived opinions of any modern translators, but on historical evidence of a much earlier date than any *MS.* or Version now extant. I cannot conclude this note better than by the following extract from a work by John Grundy, entitled "Evangelical Christianity considered, and shewn to be synonymous with Unitarianism," vol. ii. 496—498. "The spuriousness of these chapters does not at all affect the genuineness or authenticity of the remainder of the gospel history. I know that a doubt has arisen in some well-disposed minds, whether it would not be better to let the question alone, lest if we once begin to pull down we should not know where to stop. My friends, it is this objection which prevents any reformation from taking place in the established religion of this country. There are many well-disposed minds in the church, who, like Archbishop Tillotson, would be glad to be well rid of the Athanasian creed, and parts of the liturgy; who yet earnestly say, 'Let us not begin to amend; because it is impossible to say, where we may stop!' Indeed this objection is not at all consistent with our profession as Protestants. It is not the principle upon which the *Reformers* acted, not the principle upon which the *Apostles* acted, not the principle upon which our *Saviour* acted. And to the objection allow me to answer briefly, that every sound and discriminating mind *will* know where to stop. It will stop where *good evidence* ceases. It is the part of judgment to discriminate. And I conceive it to be an equal proof of a weak mind, to *believe* all, or to *doubt* of all; especially when the degrees of evidence are so disproportionate. And in the case before us, the difference is great and obvious. The gospel histories in general are founded on a rock. Their genuineness and authenticity both collectively and individually are unshaken and incapable of being shaken. But I am not therefore bound to believe that there is not a particle of dross mixed with the gold. Nor am I to believe, that by removing this dross, I must infallibly destroy the metal. On the contrary I contend that I render it more pure and valuable."

annexed to the first chapter of Luke, ver. 4th, the Editors of this new Version say: "The remaining verses of this, and the whole of the second chapter, are printed in Italics, as an indication that they are of doubtful authority: for though they are to be found in all manuscripts and versions which are now extant, yet the following considerations have induced many to doubt whether they were really written by Luke:

"1. The evangelist expressly affirms that Jesus had completed his thirtieth year in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, chap. iii. 1. 23. He must, therefore, have been born fifteen years before the death of Augustus, A.U.C. 752 or 753: but the latest period assigned for the death of Herod is the spring of A.U.C. 751, and he died, probably, the year before. See Lardner's Works, vol. i. p. 423—428, and Jones's Developement of Facts, vol. i. p. 365—368. Herod therefore must have been dead upwards of two years before Christ was born. A fact which invalidates the whole narration. See Grotius on Luke iii. 23.

"2. The two first chapters of this gospel were wanting in the copies used by Marcion, a reputed heretic of the second century; who, though he is represented by his adversaries as holding some extravagant opinions, was a man of learning and integrity, for any thing that appears to the contrary. He, like some moderns, rejected all the evangelical histories excepting Luke, of which he contended that his own was a correct and authentic copy.

"3. The evangelist, in his preface to the history of the Acts of the Apostles, reminds his friend Theophilus, Acts i. 1, that his former history contained an account of the public ministry of Jesus, but makes no allusion to the remarkable incidents contained in the two first chapters: which, therefore, probably were not written by him.

"4. If the account of the miraculous conception of

Jesus be true, he could not be the offspring of David and of Abraham, from whom it was predicted, and by the Jews expected, that the Messiah should descend.

"5. There is no allusion to any of these extraordinary facts in either of the succeeding histories of Luke, or in any other books of the New Testament. Jesus is uniformly spoken of as the son of Joseph and Mary, and as a native of Nazareth, and no expectation whatever appears to have been excited in the public mind by these wonderful and notorious events.

"6. The style of the two first chapters is different from the rest of the history—the date of the enrolment, ch. ii. 1, 2, is a great historical difficulty—that John the Baptist should have been ignorant of the person of Christ is not probable, if this narrative be true: John i. 31—34. And there are many other circumstances in the story which wear an improbable and fabulous aspect. Evanson's Disson. ch. i. sect. 3. p. 57.

"See likewise the note upon the two first chapters of Matthew, and the references there. It has been objected, that so large and gross an interpolation could not have escaped detection, and would never have been so early and so generally received.

"In reply to this objection it is observed, that this interpolation was not admitted into the Hebrew copies of Matthew's gospel, nor into Marcion's copies of Luke —that it is notorious that forged writings under the names of the apostles were in circulation almost from the apostolic age. See 2 Thess. ii. 2.—that the orthodox charge the heretics with corrupting the text; and that the heretics recriminate upon the orthodox—also that it was much easier to introduce interpolations when copies were few and scarce, than since they have been multiplied to so great a degree by means of the press: and finally, that the interpolation in question would, to the generality of Christians, be extremely gratifying, as it would lessen the odium attached to Christianity from its founder being a crucified Jew, and would elevate him

to the dignity of the heroes and demi-gods of the heathen mythology*."

How differently our ancestors in religious profession thought on these subjects, the following passage in Barclay's "Quakerism Confirmed" may suffice to show. He says, sect. iv. prop. 14. "The doctrines of the *Incarnation*, sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ, &c., are necessary every where to be preached; and being preached, to be believed and improved; as being of, and belonging unto the integral parts of Christianity. Even as the arms and legs are integral parts of a man, without which he is not a complete man, even so, though one may be a Christian—and in that state be accepted of God (as is clear in the case of Cornelius)—without the express knowledge of the *outward* birth, sufferings, &c., of Christ, yet without the same he is not a compleat Christian, as wanting the knowledge of that which serveth to the perfection and accomplishment thereof."—[Octavo Edit. 1718. vol. iii. p. 101.] Yet without undervaluing or lightly esteeming *historical evidence*, we [the Respondents] consider it as *a mere shadow* when compared to the internal evidence by which the doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ is assured to the humble and attentive mind†."

* When the above passage was adduced by the Respondents before the Committee of Appeals, *Joel Lean*, one of its members, was so much shocked with his own misconception of its import, that he exclaimed; "I hope the Respondents have not any more such extracts to adduce; the passage which has just been read *has thrilled me through with horror*." He seems not to have been aware that the Editors were not expressing their own sentiments, but such as were held by semiconverts to Christianity, who probably, like *the wise Greeks*, deemed the primitive apostolic doctrine of a crucified Jew miraculously raised from the dead by the power of God "*foolishness*."

† In order to show "how differently our ancestors in religious profession thought on these subjects," the Respondents adduced the above passage from Barclay; I judge by their concluding observations, in order to support the doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ. But in what sense they hold this tenet they left wholly uncertain. If they meant by those terms only to assert the reality

I shall now quote a passage or two from a work entitled "A Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ; by Thomas Belsham." The author is a member of the Book Society to which the Appellant is a subscriber, and this work is in the Catalogue of its Publications. This writer the Appellant will admit to be well acquainted not only with the doctrines held by Unitarians, but also with the light in which they generally view the principles and worship of other professors of Christianity. "Unitarians," says he, p. 350, "though they regard the worship of Christ as idolatrous and unscriptural, and productive of many hurtful consequences; and though on this account, they think it their duty to enter their public protest against it, are very far from presuming to criminate their fellow Christians who fall into this great and common error. It is not for them to judge of the means and opportunities of information which their mistaken brethren may possess, or of the motives by which they may be influ-

of Christ's coming in the flesh in opposition to the heresy of the Gnostics, I shall agree with them. But if the conversion of Deity into flesh, or that the "Word was properly made flesh," or the Trinitarian doctrine, which represents God as "Three Persons in One Nature," and Christ as possessing "two natures in one person," I must object to either of these notions, as irrational and unscriptural.

The concluding observation of the Respondents indeed shows how little reliance they placed on any testimony of the Scriptures on this subject. For they "consider historical evidence as a mere shadow when compared to the *internal evidence* by which (say they) the doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ is assured to the humble and attentive mind!" By "historical evidence" the Respondents must, I think, have meant the evidence of the Scriptures. I may therefore surely call upon them to re-examine the grounds of that internal evidence on which they so confidently rely. For compared with this, although they profess neither to undervalue nor lightly esteem the historical evidence of the Scriptures, they "consider it as a mere shadow." It however behoves them seriously to reflect, whether those who could make such a comparison are not in imminent danger of following mere shadows, the delusive notions and traditions of men, unsupported by the real doctrines of revelation.

enced. Nor do they pretend that the worship of Christ was ever alluded to in the cautions and warnings of the first teachers of Christianity, nor do they believe that this species of idolatry was ever in the contemplation of the sacred writers. The idolatry which they continually and justly held up to infamy and abhorrence, was heathen idolatry, which was not only in the highest degree absurd in theory, but which countenanced and even required the practice of the most odious and degrading vices*."

At p. 379 this author says, "It is not necessary to the establishment of the proper humanity of Jesus Christ to produce specific arguments for this purpose. For who would require proof that one who appears in all respects as a man is in fact a proper human being? If Christ had, as is universally allowed, all the external appearance of a man, he must in all reason be considered as a man, in no other way distinguished from his brethren than as being invested with an extraordinary divine commission." Another sitting of the Meeting might be taken up in adducing passages of similar import from the works circulated by the Book Society of which the Appellant is a member. But it may be unnecessary to proceed further, as from these we conclude the Meeting will plainly see the true character of its leading or fundamental doctrines, and how directly op-

* The Respondents are right in saying that I shall admit this author to be well acquainted with the doctrines of Unitarians, and with the light in which they *generally* view the principles and worship of other Christians. But I cannot admit that the passage quoted is in point. For it first speaks of the light in which Unitarians would regard the worship of Christ, if offered by persons holding their views of Scripture doctrine. It then states with exemplary charity that they "are very far from presuming to criminate their fellow Christians who fall into this great and common error." The latter part of this quotation is so truly candid, and the distinction it makes between heathen idolatry, and that which has been fallen into by professing Christians, is so just, that I am ready to think this part must have been approved even by the Respondents.

posed they are, to the well-known principles of our Society*.

Whether there is just ground to vindicate our principles is not the present question. Nor is it necessary to prove on this occasion that our principles are Scriptural. But as we think the Appellant has misunderstood and misrepresented them, the importance of the case requires us to show what they are. The Meeting will then be able to compare them with the doctrines which we have shown are held by those with whom the Appellant has connected himself†.

The first passage we shall adduce for this purpose is from George Fox's Journal, p. 4. where he says, "The Priest Stevens [the Clergyman of Drayton, his native Parish] asked me, 'Why Christ cried out upon the Cross, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' And why he said, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass from me; yet not my will but thine be done?' I told him; [says George Fox] At that time the sins of all mankind were upon him, and their iniquities and transgressions, with which he was wounded, which he was to bear and to be an offering for, *as he was man*, but died not as he

* If the above passage had been compared with the text which declares that "in all things it behoved him [Jesus] to be *made* like unto his brethren," or with any other text relating to Jesus Christ, the result of such a comparison, if carefully made, might have proved the above passage to be very accordant to the letter and sense of Scripture, however opposed it might be to the doctrines the Respondents describe as so "well known," I presume as being founded, not on historical evidence, but on that "internal evidence" which they so greatly prefer.

† "It is not necessary," say the Respondents, "on this occasion, to prove that our principles are Scriptural. But as we think the Appellant has misunderstood and misrepresented them, the importance of the case requires us *to show what they are*." For what purpose? To compare them with my alleged misrepresentations? No. What then? To compare them with any doctrines I have personally professed? Neither of these:—but with the doctrines which they "have shown are held by those with whom the Appellant has connected himself." They forgot, however, to prove that we were connected by any such a bond of union, or even to attempt it. The Meeting was left to make this conclusion for itself without any proof.

was God; so in that he died for all men, tasting death for every man, he was an offering for the sins of the whole world*."

I would now turn to a passage in one of the doctrinal works of George Fox, entitled "A Testimony of what we believe of Christ before he was manifest in the

* In this first effort of the Respondents to show what the principles of the Society are, they have represented George Fox as recognising the great fundamental tenet of Unitarianism, viz. that Christ had a superior to whom he prayed, and whom he acknowledged to be his God; and that his offering himself up unto death was not as God, "*but as man.*"

Fox doubtless knew that in the language of Scripture as recognised by Christ himself, those were called Gods unto whom the word of God came, and did not, therefore, hesitate to apply that term "to him whom the Father had sanctified and sent into the world." It was, however, in a qualified sense only; for he did not with *real* Trinitarians of his time hold that the second person in the Godhead expired upon the cross to satisfy the otherwise unappeasable vengeance of *the first.* Nay this doctrine was openly maintained long after. See Sir Richard Steel's Christian Hero, 6th edit. p. 33, printed in 1712; or No. 356, in that still more popular work The Spectator for April 18 in that year, being the day called "Good Friday." The language of many of Dr. Watts's hymns, which in his riper years he is known to have disapproved, is equally unscriptural. Yet are they still in common use among that numerous class of Dissenters who peculiarly claim the character of Evangelical. And it should seem that some Clergymen of the Established Church are not satisfied with all that the Liturgy, including the three Creeds and the 39 Articles, contains, without other aids to their devotion. At the house of a very pious and respectable member of the Establishment, I lately met with a "Collection of Odes, Hymns, Anthems, &c. used in the parish church of Evesham" in Worcestershire, "printed by John Agg in 1806," from which I extracted the following specimen of the extravagant ideas yet inculcated and received by congregations of Trinitarian worshipers, and too naturally flowing from that doctrine—

"Thou Earth, thy lowest centre shake,
With Jesu sympathize;
Thou Sun, as hell's deep gloom be black—
'Tis THY CREATOR dies:
See streaming from the fatal tree
His all-atoning blood,
Is this THE INFINITE? 'Tis HE,
My SAVIOUR and MY GOD."

flesh; and of his birth and preaching, and what he saith he is, himself; as also of his sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension, both as he was God, and as he was man."

In this treatise, after professing his belief in the so much controverted Text, 1 John v. 7, he adds, "And ye professors, who have given new names to the Father, the Word, and Holy Ghost, as *Trinity* and *three distinct persons*, and say the Scripture is your rule for your doctrine, but there is no such rule in the Scripture, to call them by those new names, which the Apostle that gave forth the Scripture doth not give them. And because we do not call the Father and the Word and Holy Ghost, by *your new names*, therefore you do falsely say that the Quakers deny Father Son and Holy Ghost; which we own in those names and sound words in which the holy men of God spake them forth by the Holy Ghost, which ye give *other names to*, and yet say, that ye have not *the same spirit* which they had that gave forth the Scriptures. So which is to be followed, judge yourselves. But this is the record that *God hath given* unto us *eternal life*, and *this life* is in *his Son*. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us a mind to know him, which is true; and we are in him that is true, mark that is, in his Son Jesus Christ, this same is very God and eternal life: And this we the people of God in scorn called Quakers *do witness*." Doctrinals, p. 446.* These passages are sufficient to

* If George Fox did profess his belief in 1 John v. 7. as the Respondents say, is that enough in their estimation to establish its authenticity? However this may be, it is plain from this passage that Fox objected to giving new or unscriptural names to the Father the Word and Holy Ghost, as *Trinity* and *three distinct persons*; for he warmly censures the practice. In this passage also I may remark that "*eternal life*" is described as the gift of God "in his Son." And (it is most evident by the text of the Bishops' Bible, which Fox quotes but not quite correctly,) that "by him that is true" in the 1 John v. 20. is meant the true God and giver of everlasting life, for it adds, as the Greek requires, "thorough [or

show how different the sentiments of George Fox and of our early friends were, from those openly professed by the Appellant. But as he has in some of his publications laid considerable stress on a passage in the same volume, [see his Reply to Vindex, p. 36—38, and his Christian Unitarianism, p. 90—94], I wish to adduce enough of the context to show that when George Fox wrote his answer to the speech or declaration of Sultan Mahomet the great Turk, he believed in the Godhead of Christ, though he denied that "the *true* Christian's God" had been or could be crucified. "So it is clear," says he, "that the eternal invisible incomprehensible God was not nor can—be crucified; but Christ the Son of God suffered according to the flesh, *not in his Godhead.* So Christ died for our sins, according to the Old and New Testament. For as in Adam all died, so even in Christ shall all be made alive, and that Christ *by the grace of God* should taste death for every man." p. 1006.*

through] his Son Jesus Christ." And so Newcome renders it. Whereas the received text says, "*even* in his Son," &c. apparently for the unwarrantable purpose of making the text call Jesus Christ "the true God." But I see no reason to suppose George Fox so understood the text; or that this was what he tells us in the conclusion of this passage, "the Quakers do witness." Yet the Respondents say, "these passages are sufficient to show how different the sentiments of our early friends were, from those openly professed by the Appellant." How vague is this without some direct comparison of these sentiments with mine!

* This passage seems very oddly adduced to prove Fox's belief "in the Godhead of Christ." Its fair import, when the context is duly considered, is surely this: That when Christ was crucified, neither that divine power which dwelt in him, nor God himself, was or could be crucified. For Fox adds, that it was "the man Christ Jesus" who "offered up himself;" and the Respondents' quotation shows that in Fox's opinion he did this "*by the grace of God.*"

In the same paragraph Fox says: It was Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him, that the Jews with their wicked hands did take, crucify, and slay." But, that "it was God who loosed the pangs

We would now call the Meeting's attention to a few passages from the works of Isaac Penington: "Concerning the Gospel Ministration," he expresses himself in these terms [vol. i. p. 693]: "If the Gospel be not a ministration of words or letter, but of spirit, life, and power; and if it was the intent of God, that men should not stick in words or testimonies concerning the thing, but come to the thing itself, and live in the Son's life and power, and feel the Son living in them, then they are greatly mistaken who think to gather a rule to themselves out of the testimonies and declarations of things in the Scriptures, and do not wait upon the Lord to receive his spirit itself to become their rule, guide, and way. For these are all one; the truth is the way; the truth which lives and abides in the heart (where it is received and entertained) is the way; the rule is the guide: for God is *One*. There are many names, but the thing is *One*. The life, the power, the wisdom in the Father, Son, and Spirit, *is all one:* yea, they themselves are *One*, perfectly *One*, not at all divided or separated; but where the Father is, the Son is; and where the Son is, the Spirit is; and where the Spirit is, there is both the Father and the Son, who tabernacle in man in the day of the Gospel.* And where these are, *there* that is which is to be preferred before all words, which was afore them, and is in nature spirit and glory above them. He that hath the Son, hath life, even the life eternal, which the words testify of. He that hath the Son, hath him which is true; and he that is in the Son, is in him that is true; and abiding there cannot

of death, raised him up the third day; and exalted him at his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and forgiveness of sins."

* This passage is the very essence of Sabellianism, expressed in such language as no person acquainted with that doctrine can well mistake for any other. It has distinctly those characters which, as Dr. Samuel Clarke has justly observed, although "seeming in words to magnify the name of the Son and holy Spirit, in reality" as matter of doctrine "*take away their very existence.*"

be deceived; but he that is not there, is deceived, let him apprehend and gather out of the Scriptures what he can. Oh! how is God glorified, and how is the redemption and real salvation of the soul witnessed in this despised dispensation of truth, *which God hath held forth in these latter days!* Blessed be the name of the Lord, who hath hid this pure dispensation of life from the eye of the prudent worldly-wise part in every man, revealing it only to the babish simplicity which is of his Son, and which lives in and by him!"

The next passage we shall adduce is from a Tract of Isaac Penington's entitled "Life and Immortality brought to light through the Gospel. Being a true discovery of the nature and ground of the Religion and Kingdom of Christ, in several weighty Queries, propounded; and other serious matters treated of, *highly importing the eternal salvation of Souls.*"

The 11th section of this work treats "of the threefold appearance of Christ; to wit, under the Law, in a body of Flesh, and in his spirit and power. 1st. Under the Law. Various were the appearances of Christ, sometimes as an angel, in the likeness of a man; so to Abraham, and so to Jacob; when Jacob wrestled with him, and prevailed, and had overcome; so to Joshua, or the captain of the Lord's host, at his besieging Jericho; so to Moses in the bush, he appeared as an angel, Acts vii. 35; so likewise in visions. Those glorious appearances of God to the prophets in visions were the appearances of Christ; as particularly, that glorious appearance of God sitting upon a throne, and his train filling the Temple, and the Seraphims crying *Holy! holy! holy is the Lord of Hosts*, his glory is the fulness of the whole earth! Isaiah vi. This was an appearance of Christ to Isaiah, as is manifest John xii. 41. where the Evangelist (relating to that place) useth this expression: *These things said Isaiah, when he saw his glory, and spake of him.* So he was the angel of God's presence, which went before the Jews, in all their journeyings

and travels out of Egypt, through the sea, and in the wilderness, and in the time of the Judges; and wrought all their deliverances for them, as is signified Isa. lxiii. 9. 'In all their afflictions he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them,' &c. So with the three children, he appeared in the midst of the fiery furnace, *in a form like the Son of God*, as Nebuchadnezzar judged. Dan. iii. 25." Vol. ii. p. 376.*

At page 26 of the same volume, in a small tract called "An Incitation to Professors, seriously to consider, whether they or we fail, in the true acknowledgment and owning of the Christ which died at Jerusalem," the same honourable Elder in our Society says, "Now the Scriptures do expressly distinguish between Christ, and the garment which he wore; between him that came, and the body in which he came; between the substance which was veiled, and the veil which veiled it.

* Of "the threefold appearance of Christ," spoken of in the passage quoted as above by the Respondents, I should have thought that which related to his appearance "*in a body of flesh*," was by far the most pertinent to the questions at issue between us. Instead of which they chose to dwell on his supposed appearances "under the law," but merely by reading the passage without any explanation, and they passed over in silence all that their author says concerning the coming of Christ in the flesh.

This did not suit their purpose, and yet it is so plain as to need little or no comment to render the principal part of it intelligible. For under this head the author asserts that "he [Christ] *did nothing of himself*, or *in his own will*, or *for himself*; but all *in the will and time of the Father*." Thus, according to Penington, when Jesus "*disputed* with the doctors and teachers of the law, hearing and asking them questions," he discovered "the pure wisdom of the Father *which dwelt in him*." If "he preached the gospel," it was "in the spirit and *power of the Father*." If he "went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed," it was still "as *his Father's spirit led and guided him*." "Thus," says Penington, "he did always please his Father, and seek the honour of him that sent him; 'and was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, being willing to drink of the cup which *his Father* gave him to drink." Can any words more expressly ascribe all that Christ did or taught, to his God and Father, than these? I think not; and yet it appears that Penington held the Arian notion of the pre-existence of Christ when he wrote them.

Lo I come; a body hast thou prepared me. There is plainly he, and the body in which he came. There was the outward vessel and the inward life. This we certainly know, and can never call the bodily garment Christ, but that which appeared and dwelt in the body. Now if ye indeed know the Christ of God, tell us plainly what that is which appeared in the body? Whether that was not the Christ before it took up the body, after it took up the body, and for ever?

"And then their confining of Christ to that body, plainly manifesteth that they want the knowledge of him in spirit. For Christ is the Son of the Father; *he is the infinite eternal Being*, one with the Father and with the Spirit, and cannot be divided from either; cannot be any where, where they are not, nor can be excluded from any place where they are. He may take up a body, and appear in it, but cannot be confined to be no where else but there; no not at the very time while he is there. Christ, while he was here on earth, yet was not excluded from being in heaven with the Father at the very same time; as he himself said concerning himself: *The Son of man which is in heaven*, John iii. 13. Nor was the Father excluded from being with him in the body; but the Father was in him, and he in the Father: whereupon he said to Philip, *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.* What! did every one that saw that body, see the Father also? Nay, not so; but he that saw Christ, the Son of the living God, whom flesh and blood revealed not, but the Father only (Matt. xvi. 16, 17), he saw the Father also*."

* This quotation from the same author, the Respondents took care to inform us, relates to "the Christ *that died* at Jerusalem." That is, to the man Christ Jesus. Not to the true Christian's *ever-living* God, who is without variableness or shadow of turning. Yet in this passage as read by the Respondents, it is said, "We [the Quakers] *can never call* the bodily garment *Christ*, but that which *dwelt in the body*." Now according to this writer, what was that which dwelt in the man Christ Jesus? He says, in the immediate context of the last passage quoted by the Respondents, that it was

We now request the Meeting's attention to a few passages in "Barclay's Catechism," which was first published in 1673. The 3d Chapter is "Of Jesus Christ being manifest in the flesh; the use and end of it." Under this head, the 2d question is, Was not Jesus Christ in being, before he appeared in the flesh? What clear Scriptures prove this, against such as *erroneously* assert the contrary?*

Answ. "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee

"*the pure wisdom—the spirit and power of the Father*—that he did nothing *of himself*."

Yet are we now told that "Christ—is *the infinite eternal Being!*" But the author does not profess to have learnt this Sabellian doctrine concerning Christ "from the letter of the Scriptures," but from a supposed "*knowledge of him in spirit*."

* By the use of the word "*erroneously*," in the above passage, Barclay appears to intimate that some of the prevalent notions concerning the pre-existence of Jesus Christ were unscriptural and unfounded. And although he held "that even the world was created by Christ," he seems to allude in like manner to certain unsound notions concerning "the divinity of Christ," by limiting his proofs under that head "to such as *falsely* deny the same."

At the end of his Catechism, Barclay says, "Note, reader, that I have here throughout made use of the last common translation of the Bible. And if I would have made use of the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, I could have produced divers other very clear *Scriptures*, which in the common translation ARE CORRUPTED AND PERVERTED."

If the received text contains such errors as these, it is surely allowable to correct them, so that it be done on sound principles of biblical criticism. The translators of the authorized version, it should ever be remembered, were so far from being impartial with regard to some of the most important points of doctrine, that they appear to have concurred with the general voice of the clergy of the established church (with the bishop of London as prosecutor at their head), in consigning to the flames in Smithfield the virtuous and learned Bartholomew Legatt, for being an Unitarian on what he deemed conclusive scriptural evidence.

If the received text contains such passages as Barclay affirmed, and other persons have conclusively proved to the entire satisfaction of all competent judges, it is highly proper and important to have these perversions and corruptions of the text pointed out and clearly distinguished from the real doctrines of revelation.

shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. Mic. v. 2.

" In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; the same was in the beginning with God: all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. John i. 1, 2, 3.

" Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am. John viii. 58.

" And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. John xvii. 5.

" And to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ. Eph. iii. 9.

" For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him. Col. i. 16.

" God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds. Heb. i. 2."

Barclay next says, " These are very clear, that even the world was created by Christ; but what Scriptures prove the divinity of Christ, against such as *falsely* deny the same?

" A. And the Word was God. John i. 1.

" Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. *Amen.* Rom. ix. 5.

" Who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God. Phil. ii. 6.

" And we know, that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his

Son Jesus Christ: this is the true God, and eternal Life. 1 John v. 20.

"Q. What are the glorious names the Scripture gives unto Jesus Christ, *the eternal Son of God?**

"A. And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Isa. ix. 5.

"Who is the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every creature. Col. i. 15.

"Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person (or more properly, according to the Greek, of his substance). Heb. i. 3.

"And he was cloathed with a vesture dipt in blood, and his name is called the Word of God. Rev. xix. 13.

"Q. After what manner was the birth of Christ?

"A. Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: Whenas his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph (before they came together) she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Matt. i. 18.

"And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favour with God: and behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus: he shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore

* On what ground Barclay chose to deviate from the simplicity of Scripture language in putting a question concerning "the *eternal* Son of God," I cannot say. But in so doing, it is obvious no strictly scriptural answer *can be given*. Stating such a question, however, seems to have led very naturally to a text erroneously rendered for a reply; viz. Isaiah ix. 5. The text which follows, is, however, so far from calling the *name* of Jesus Christ "the mighty God," that it says, he "is *the image* of the invisible God," as was Adam also, but not "the first-born from the dead," as was the man Christ Jesus.

also that Holy Thing that shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God. Luke i. 30, 31, 32, 34, 35. *

"Q. Was Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary, and supposed to be the son of Joseph, a true and real man?

"A. Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the Devil. Heb. ii. 14.

"For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham; wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest, &c. Heb. ii. 16, 17.

"For we have not an High-Priest, which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted, as we are, yet without sin. Heb. iv. 15.

"And the gift of grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. Rom. v. 15.

"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept: for since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. xv. 20, 21. †

"Q. After what manner doth the Scripture assert the conjunction and unity of the eternal Son of God in and with the man Christ Jesus?

"A. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among

* There is no doubt but Barclay held the doctrine of Mary's miraculous conception of her son Jesus, as Servetus, Socinus, Lardner, Cardale, and many other Unitarians did also.

† That Jesus Christ was "a true and real man," is so unquestionably the doctrine of the New Testament, that with the exception of the Gnostics, a very early sect, who considered him as a man in appearance only, very few professors of Christianity have doubted his being strictly and properly one of the human race, a prophet like unto Moses, but the most distinguished Son and Servant of the Most High. And all the texts quoted under this head, are so many proofs that these opinions concerning Christ are scriptural and well-founded.

us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth. John i. 14.

"For he, whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him. John iii. 34.

"Now God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with Power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil; for God was with him. Acts x. 38.

"For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell. Col. i. 19.

"For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Col. ii. 9.

"In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Col. ii. 3."*

It is not necessary, perhaps, to quote more of this Catechism; but the Appellant having laid much stress on some passages in Barclay's Apology, as favourable to the sentiments imputed to him as erroneous and unsound, we would also appeal to that work. In the 5th sect. of the 2d Prop. the Author expresses himself thus: "For the infinite and most wise God, who is the *foundation, root* and *spring of all operation*, hath wrought all things by his eternal Word and Son. This is that WORD that was in the beginning with God, and was God, by whom all things were made. This is that Jesus Christ, by whom *God created all things*, by whom and for whom all things were created that are in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or

* On Barclay's departure from Scripture language in this "Scriptural Catechism" I have spoken above. In this question he goes further from it than he did on that occasion. And he thereby insinuates that the Scripture asserts "the *conjunction* and *unity* of the *eternal* Son of God in and with *the man Christ Jesus*." The texts Barclay has referred to and quoted as answers to this question, say nothing approaching this language. The first text, John i. 14. as quoted by Barclay, Wm. Penn has shown, vol. ii. p. 137, to be erroneously rendered; the others assert or imply that all the powers and fulness of Christ were derived *from God the Father*.

principalities, or powers. Col. i. 16. Who therefore is called the First-born of every creature. Col. i. 15. As then that infinite and incomprehensible fountain of life and motion operateth in the creatures, by his own eternal word and power; so no creature has access again unto him but in and by the Son, according to his own express words, No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him. Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22. And again he himself saith, I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me. John xiv. 6. Hence he is fitly called, the Mediator betwixt God and man: for having been with God from all eternity, being himself God, and also in time partaking of the nature of man, through him is the goodness and love of God conveyed to mankind, and by him again man receiveth and partaketh of these mercies."

Such are the terms in which Barclay has professed his belief in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Are we then warranted in believing that Barclay denied his divinity? The Appellant dwells upon one side of the question only, and on those texts which speak only of the human nature of Christ, as is the usual custom with Unitarians*.

* The above passage shows that Barclay considered Jesus Christ as the agent "by whom God created all things," according to the Arian doctrine; but it also shows that he looked up to "the infinite and most wise God" as "the foundation, root, and spring of all operation"—as "the infinite and incomprehensible fountain of life and motion." After quoting the above passage, the Respondents asked, "Are we then warranted in believing that Barclay denied his [Christ's] divinity?" Perhaps not absolutely. But it is plain from this passage and various others in his works, that he did not hold the doctrine of his deity or equality with God the Father in any strict or usual sense. They next allege that "the Appellant dwells upon one side of the question only, and on those texts which speak only of the human nature of Christ, as is," say they most unfoundedly, "the usual custom with Unitarians." Am I then to understand from the Respondents, that all the texts I have cited in this controversy relating to Christ, as well as those usually alleged by Unitarians, "speak only of his human nature?" The

The belief of Barclay in the divinity of Christ is strongly expressed in the 13th sect. of the 5th and 6th Prop. on the latter part of which the Appellant insisted so largely, both in Latin and English, before the Quarterly Meeting*. The entire paragraph is as follows: "But by this [the doctrine of *the new man, Christ within, the hope of glory*] as we do not at all intend to equal ourselves to that *holy man*, the Lord Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary, in whom all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily; so neither do we *destroy the reality of his present existence*, as some have falsely calumniated us. For, though we affirm that Christ dwells in us, yet not immediately, but mediately, as he is in that seed which is *in us*; whereas he, to wit, the *eternal Word*, which was with God, and was God, dwelt immediately in that *holy man*. He then is as the head, and we as the members; he the vine, and we the branches. Now as the soul of man dwells otherwise,

texts I have quoted relate to him as *the son of man*, his most usual appellation in the four evangelists, also as a teacher sent from God—as our Lord and Master—the Messiah and Son of God during his ministry or divine mission upon earth—of his resurrection and exaltation at "the right hand of the power of God," and of his being the one Mediator between God and men, *the man Christ Jesus*—by whom God shall judge the world in righteousness. These and other scriptural characters of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, *under God*, are asserted by me and in the texts I have quoted, which, say the Respondents, "*speak only of his human nature.*" At the same time, if the apostle Peter did not hesitate to describe his brethren as "partakers of the divine nature," in a much higher degree must this appertain to him to whom "God giveth not the spirit by measure."

* The Respondents say the belief of Barclay in the divinity of Christ is strongly marked in the 13th sect. of the 5th and 6th Propositions. In the first part of which Barclay says, "By this seed, Grace and *Word of God* and light, wherewith we say every one is enlightened—*we understand not, the proper essence and nature of God precisely taken;* which is not divisible into parts or measures, as being a most pure simple Being void of all composition or division." This explanatory part of the section the Respondents chose to pass over. It is I think perfectly clear from this passage, that Barclay did not consider "*the word of God*," as precisely taken, *God himself.*

and in a far more immediate manner in the head and in the heart, than in the hands or legs; and as the sap, virtue and life of the vine lodgeth far otherwise in the stock and root, than in the branches; so God dwelleth otherwise in the man Jesus, than in us.

"We also freely reject the heresy of Appollinarius, who denied him to have any soul, but said the body was only acted by the Godhead: as also the error of *Eutyches*, who made the manhood to be wholly swallowed up of the Godhead. Wherefore, as we believe he was a true and real man; so we also believe, that he continues so to be glorified in the heavens, in soul and body, by whom God shall judge the world, in the great and general day of judgment*."

As Barclay has shown what his meaning in this passage really was, in his Reply to John Brown's Examination of his Apology, I will give his explanation of it. In the third volume of his Works, page 387, he says, "His (John Brown's) next perversion is yet more gross and abusive, p. 238, where from my denying 'That we equal ourselves to that *holy man* the Lord Jesus Christ, &c. in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily;' he concludes I affirm him to be no more but a *holy man;* and because I use the words *plenitudo Divinitatis* that I deny his Deity; which is an abominable falsehood. I detest that doctrine of the Socinians, and deny there is any ground for their distinction; and when I confess him to be a *holy man*, I deny him not to be GOD, as this man most injuriously would insinuate; for I confess him to be really both true God,

* After reading the latter part of the section because I had insisted upon it so largely before the Quarterly Meeting, the Respondents did not attempt to examine my reasoning upon it, as stated pp. 274—277 of my Narrative, or to explain how Barclay's belief in the reality of the present personal existence of Jesus Christ as "a true and real man—glorified in the heavens in soul and body," can be reconciled with a belief in the divinity of Christ in any reputedly orthodox sense of that doctrine.

and true man. And whereas he rails and exclaims here and in the following page at a monstrous rate, as if the comparison I bring of the difference betwixt every Saint and the man Jesus, from the sap its being otherwise in the root and stock of the tree than in the branches, did further confirm our equalling ourselves to him, he doth but show his folly; since Christ himself useth the same comparison, John xv. 5. *I am the vine, ye are the branches*, to which I alluded. And upon this he runneth out in a vehement strain of railing, p. 239, exclaiming against us, as if we denied the Deity of Christ, and his incarnation; which is utterly false*."

* By this extract the Respondents proposed to give Barclay's construction of the foregoing passage. But this "explanation" is little or nothing to the purpose, because it is entirely silent respecting the principal subjects treated of in that passage. It says not a word respecting Barclay's belief, which is there so strongly stated, "in the reality of Christ's present existence *as a true and real man, glorified in the heavens*, by whom God *shall judge the world*." These were the points on which I so largely insisted before the Quarterly Meeting, as the Respondents well knew. I invited them to continue this irrelevant passage a little further, that they might come to a part of Barclay's reply to Brown more to the purpose. But this they declined. Just below in the same page Barclay says, his opponent "repeateth this calumny, p. 242, adding that my saying 'That we believe what is written of the conception, birth, life and death of Christ, &c. to be true; doth not vindicate us from it:' and then he subjoins, 'Do you believe that that body which was crucified at Jerusalem, rose again and is now in glory?' Speak your mind here if you dare."

Barclay replies, "For answer then I say; I do believe, that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was crucified at Jerusalem, was again raised *by the power of God*; in which glorified body *the Lord Jesus Christ dwelleth*. And I dare him to shew where in my Apology, or elsewhere, I ever said or wrote any thing to the contrary." The Respondents alike avoided this passage, and another near it which shows that Barclay sometimes applied the term God not in the highest and most strict sense, as he there tells us those "do, who say *the man Christ is God*, and by reason of the personal union sometimes ascribe the actions of the one nature to the person denominated by the other; as the Westminster Confession itself acknowledges." ch. 8.

As

These extracts from the writings of our early Friends will, we are persuaded, appear to the Yearly Meeting incompatible with the principles of that association the London Unitarian Book Society of which the Appellant is a member. Its *general principles* strike at the fundamental tenet of the Society of Friends, the doctrine of divine grace in the heart inwardly revealed*.

As for the opinion of those who affirm Christ "to be *no more* but a holy man," which Barclay mentions in the passage the Respondents quoted as a doctrine which he detested, I shall only say I am far from approving it, as I imagine every Unitarian Christian would also. Barclay was I conceive a Sabellian rather than an Arian, perhaps more strictly, something between both; for some of his opinions seem to incline to the one hypothesis, and some to the other; but none of them that I know of, have the same leaning towards the doctrine of the Trinity, on which, as Thomas Clarkson has observed Portraiture of Quakerism, vol. ii. p. 315. he is *entirely silent* in his "Apology for the true Christian Divinity."

* That various parts of the foregoing extracts produced by the Respondents to show what the principles of Friends are, cannot be reconciled with those of the London Unitarian Book Society, I grant; because they assert or imply some other authority for Christian doctrine than the Scriptures contain, which are the only authentic written record of the Christian revelation. Whereas the members of that Book Society, so far as I know, acknowledge no other authority in matters of Christian faith. Yet say the Respondents, "Its *general principles* strike at the fundamental tenet of the Society of Friends, the doctrine of divine grace in the heart inwardly revealed." They, however, adduced no proof of this. Assertion without it answered their purpose equally well.

Let us now calmly inquire whether this assertion be well founded, and if it be, what is the just inference to which it leads. The *general*, the *only* principles upon which this Book Society are founded, are those of the Scriptures, "the genuine doctrines of revelation" as there laid down. If the fundamental tenet of the Society of Friends and that of the Christian revelation be the same, the general principles of this association are in no degree opposed to that tenet. If they are not the same, there may be some contrariety between the said fundamental tenet and those "general principles," as the Respondents allege. The proper question then is, which of these Societies adhere most truly and strictly to the testimony of Scripture? that which acknowledges its authority to be paramount to all other; or that which, according to the Respondents, estimates its evidence on matters of doctrine as

The Appellant has said much respecting Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken, as being decisively in favour of the doctrines he so strenuously and publicly advocates. The Author, though a man of undoubted sincerity and a distinguished m nber and minister of our Society, has expressed his sentiments in that work in ambiguous language; and having written an Apology for the same, it is reasonable to receive it as an explanation of the former publication. This work is entitled "Innocency with her open Face," and was written in the same year as the tract before noticed *. About five years after he

a mere shadow, when compared to the *internal evidence* by which its members persuade themselves the right apprehension of doctrines is assured to the humble and attentive mind? As if it was a greater mark of humility and attention to expect doctrines to be "*inwardly revealed*" to each individual, instead of being so plainly recorded in the Scriptures that he that reads with a sincere desire to know and to do the will of God, may understand.

The apostle Paul seems to have judged far otherwise. He declared that the advantages of his countrymen over the Gentiles, though "much every way," *consisted* "*chiefly*," not "in the law written in their hearts;" that moral sense of right and wrong, of virtue and vice, of justice and injustice, which the equal and benevolent Parent of mankind hath in the riches of his mercy and goodness universally impressed upon the human mind; but "*because that unto them* [the Jews] *were committed the* [written] *Oracles of God.*" And in these advantages of "being instructed out of the law" *of a better covenant*, Christians possessing the New Testament may still more richly participate. But I fear those are in great danger of not reaping much of these benefits, who esteem historical evidences of the revealed mind and will of God "*as a mere shadow*," compared with their own persuasions, however strong, that they are favoured with superior internal illumination, by which they fancy they are assured of the truth of doctrines, and claim the right of censuring their brethren as in error "*for being mere Scripturians.*"

* It is rather the Apology for the Sandy Foundation Shaken, that is written in "ambiguous language," than that work, as the Respondents erroneously represent. Nor was it written as an explanation of that publication. But they attempted to prove neither of these assertions. Of all the author's doctrinal Tracts it is the least "ambiguous," and the most argumentative. The one called an Apology for it was intended as a defence of that work, as the Apology of Barclay was of the true Christian divinity. It con-

published a reply to John Faldo's vindication of his book called "Quakerism no Christianity," in which he notices the Sandy Foundation Shaken in such terms as may be proper to mention on this occasion. Penn says, vol. ii. p. 453, "At the time of our disputation with T. D. T. V. T. D. and W. M. at the Spittle, being engaged *in the negative* concerning the common doctrine of distinct and separate personality [in the Deity], he T. F. (that is, as the Appellant admits, Thomas Firmin*) and some others fell into great intimacy with us. Who but we†, in his and their thoughts? at what time they were not quite discovered by us. But pulling off their masks, at last we found them to have been the followers of J. Biddle, in that which is commonly called the Socinian way; and that their peculiar regard to us came from *an implicit vindication of one of their principles*, for which we came under the scandal and odium of Socinians. Pulpits rang how the Quakers had unmasked themselves on that occasion; and their warm disputes in our defence did not a little strengthen the common reports of us, and me in particular. When my book entitled The Sandy Foundation Shaken came out, it being a further detection of what we call errors, and it happening that Socinians did the same, as if I was a rank Socinian (who never read any one Socinian book in all my life, if looked into one at that time,) so these men, at least T. F. [Thomas Firmin] was ready to believe me nearer akin to them, than, God knows, I was;

tains no intimation whatever that the Sandy Foundation Shaken is expressed in ambiguous language, nor that it inculcates any erroneous doctrine.

* The Respondent not appearing to know who was meant by T. F. before mentioned in Penn's works, and here alluded to, I informed him, it was no doubt Thomas Firmin, a friend of Archbishop Tillotson's, and a Citizen of London highly respected for his benevolence by persons of all persuasions.

† That is, William Penn, George Whitehead, and others who at the aforesaid disputation opposed the doctrine of distinct and separate personality; that is, the doctrine of the Trinity.

that is to say, *in denying the divinity of Christ**. At this time what would he not have done for me, if I might have believed him! and in reality the man was wonderfully taken; but which was grievous, he was shamefully mistaken; and when he came to read my confession to Christ's eternal Godhead, in my little book intituled "Innocency with her Open Face," (though he had another, called "The Guide Mistaken," that, p. 28,

* By this passage it appears that William Penn, George Whitehead and some other Friends were engaged *in the negative* in a disputation concerning the common doctrine of the Trinity, or of "distinct and separate personality." And so well did they manage the argument against that doctrine, that it brought about, as the Respondents showed, a "great intimacy" between them and some reputed Socinians, one of whose principles they implicitly, that is decidedly, vindicated. What was this? It could be no other than the strict Unity of God, the only, at least the principal subject under discussion. For which commendable conduct they incurred "the scandal and odium of Socinians, and William Penn in particular." *But not from the Quakers.* They held him to be sound, Orthodox, and a true Gospel Minister at the time it was published. Some time after this The Sandy Foundation Shaken came out, and therefore not "in the heat of debate" as J.G. Bevan once represented under the signature of Vindex; but very deliberately in the face of much obloquy and abuse. But what was the real character of the work on the Author's own statement five years after it was published, as shown by the Respondents? That it contained "a farther detection" of what the Quakers of that time called "errors," and it happened "that Socinians did the same." This decisive vindication of "one of their principles" produced a suspicion that Penn was "a rank Socinian." In reply to this what does Penn say? that he renounced this principle because they held it? No. But that he had "never read any one Socinian book, if looked into one, at that time."

It was from the Scriptures that William Penn derived the doctrines he has laid down so clearly and unambiguously in The Sandy Foundation Shaken. And yet having been educated in a Trinitarian Church, and having no doubt, as a student at Oxford, subscribed the 39 Articles, it is no wonder he was not so near of kin to these Socinians as to deny "the divinity of Christ."

The plain fact appears to be this, that William Penn considered that doctrine in the sense in which he held it, to be sound and scriptural, and at the same time perfectly consistent with his admirable defence of the unity, mercy, and purity of God in his Sandy Foundation Shaken.

abundantly doth the same, which was writ, and read by him before the "Sandy Foundation" was thought of,) he deserted me, broke all bonds of friendship, and rules of civility, and his extreme shows of kindness turned to continual excessive reflections. He would have it a *Retraction*, rather than be thought to be mistaken. He had built his hopes too high for the foundation, and then became wrathful that they fell. And though I sought his friendly behaviour, having no thought in my heart but love and friendship to him, yet so invincible was his displeasure, that there was no holding for me of his good will, *and believing Christ to be God**."

From this passage it may be safely inferred that William Penn in writing the Sandy Foundation Shaken never intended to deny the divinity of Christ. In proof of his continued assertion of that doctrine he here appeals to a work of his published before that was thought of, although in the same year, in which he asserts his belief in the eternal Godhead of Christ. That the Sandy Foundation Shaken was written to refute the notion of three distinct and separate persons in the Godhead, the vulgar doctrine of Satisfaction, and the justification of impure persons by an imputative righteousness, cannot be denied. The Appellant seems, however, to have much mistaken the general design of the Author in writing it, and to have misrepresented the import of one passage in particular, which it seems proper to notice lest it should mislead others. In page 69 of his Narrative, he says "Penn describes Jesus Christ as a finite and impotent creature." Now it appears to us that Penn is not speaking of Christ in that passage, but of mankind, or of human nature in its fallen de-

* By this passage the Respondents have shown that five years after the Apology for The Sandy Foundation Shaken was written and published, its Author denied it to be "*a Retraction*" of that work, and charged Thomas Firmin with being "shamefully mistaken," for so representing it. See Verax's Christian Unitarianism Vindicated, pp. 63—68.

generate state. Surely Penn could not mean to describe Christ in such terms, as he professes to have always believed in his eternal Godhead, and even "that he is the mighty God*." In common with our early Friends

* That William Penn held, in some sense or other, "Christ to be God,"—the divinity of Christ, or what is sometimes called the Godhead of Christ, I have never questioned. But what any of these doctrines amount to, more than the divinity of that power which dwelt in Christ Jesus, namely, that of the Father, in the mouths of those who reject the notion of any distinct and separate Persons in the Godhead, I cannot make out. The Respondents admit the Sandy Foundation Shaken was written to refute this notion or doctrine, and its kindred tenets "the vulgar doctrine of Satisfaction," &c.

How then have I *at all mistaken* "the general design of the Author in writing it?" Is it by giving credit to his solemn asseveration near the conclusion of that work, where he calls the righteous God of Heaven to bear him record that he has therein "sought nothing below the defence of his unity, mercy, and purity, against the rude and impetuous assaults of tradition, press, and pulpit."?

The Respondents well knew I professed to have read this work in early life with much attention, and that the strong impression it then made had never been effaced, but confirmed. Yet am I now told by those who flinch from the task of examining its arguments, that I seem to have much mistaken the general design of the Author in writing it. This is passing strange. I verily believe it is impossible for any person of common understanding to give this work a cursory, much less an attentive perusal, without seeing plainly the general character and design of the work. Its perusal may, I admit, shock the powerful prejudices of some readers, without surmounting them. On others it may produce a clear conviction that its general argument is supported by right reason and the testimony of Scripture. And on all that read it with any attention its impression, I am persuaded, must be distinct and definite, not indistinct and ambiguous.

The Respondents say, however, that I "have misrepresented the import of one passage in particular," which they notice "lest it should mislead others." The reader of these pages shall be enabled to judge of this. Under a head entitled by Penn "The Vulgar Doctrine of Satisfaction being dependent on the Second Person of the Trinity, *refuted from Scripture*," after much sound argument, the Author proposes to point out "the absurdities, that unavoidably follow the comparison of this doctrine with the sense of Scripture," which he does thus; viz.

1. "That God is gracious to forgive, and yet it is impossible for him unless the debt be fully satisfied.

2. "That the finite and impotent Creature is more capable of

generally he received the testimony of that text in the Philippians ii. 6, which declares that Christ Jesus "being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." I am aware that the received version of this text has been objected to; but whether it be rightly rendered or not, does not affect the question of his pre-existence before he was born of the Virgin Mary, for which we are contending*.

extending mercy and forgiveness, than the infinite and omnipotent Creator.

3. "That God so loved the world he gave his only Son to save it, and yet that God stood off in high displeasure, and Christ gave himself to God as a complete Satisfaction to his offended justice: with many more such-like gross consequences that might be drawn."

Such is Penn's statement verbatim. And the Respondents charge me with misrepresenting it, for saying it describes Jesus Christ as a "finite and impotent Creature;" and his God and Father, as "the infinite and omnipotent Creator," who is essentially "merciful in himself, and gracious to forgive, without being rendered placable by another."

In order to show that this is a misrepresentation, the Respondents say:—"Now it appears to us that Penn is not speaking of Christ in that passage, but of mankind, or of *human nature* in its fallen degenerate state." The Respondents must surely have overlooked the subject on which Penn was treating, for with such a character annexed to it, I cannot suppose they meant to speak of Christ's human nature; and yet surely no other person than Jesus Christ was ever represented by the advocates for the vulgar doctrine of Satisfaction, as the second Person in the Trinity, "or as having fully satisfied the offended justice of his Father." The Respondents will not say that fallen degenerate human nature was ever supposed capable of doing either. Granting this, it is incontrovertibly clear that Penn applied the terms "finite and impotent Creature" to Jesus Christ, because he alone was represented by the doctrine Penn was opposing, as more capable of extending mercy and forgiveness than the infinite and omnipotent Creator, whom the same doctrine describes as standing off in high displeasure till Christ gave himself to God as a complete satisfaction to his offended justice. Nay, Penn a little lower down argues the matter thus—"The justice offended being infinite, his [God's] satisfaction ought to bear a proportion therewith, which Jesus Christ, *as man*, could never pay, *he being finite*, and from a finite cause could not proceed an infinite effect; for so man may be said to bring forth God, since nothing below the Divinity itself can rightly be called infinite."

* Is it then only the Arian notion of the pre-existence of Christ,

In a work of William Penn's published in 1698, about thirty years after the "Sandy Foundation Shaken," entitled "A Testimony to the Truth of God, as held by the People called Quakers," he expresses their faith in Christ in the following terms; vol. ii. p. 877. "We believe him according to Scripture to be the son of Abraham, David, and Mary, after the flesh, and also God over all, blessed for ever. So that he that is within us, is also without us, even the same that laid down his precious life for us, rose again from the dead, and ever liveth to make intercession for us, being the blessed and only Mediator betwixt God and man, and him by whom God will finally judge the world, both quick and dead. All which we as sincerely and steadfastly believe as any other Society of people, whatever may be ignorantly or maliciously insinuated to the contrary, either by our declared enemies, or mistaken neighbours*."

It may now be proper to notice the doctrines of the Society as given forth in 1693, and inserted in Sewel's History, p. 642, as four or five of the persons whose

and not his co-equality with God the Father, which the Respondents contend for, by appealing to this text? That Christ was, in a certain sense, in the form of God, is not disputed; but how this imports the *personal pre-existence* of "the one Mediator between God and men, *the man Christ Jesus*," I do not understand. The objectionable part of the received rendering of this text is, that it erroneously asserts the Apostle *to have known* that Christ "*thought*" what he is no where in the Scriptures recorded *to have uttered*, but often to have asserted the contrary. He could do nothing of himself, but was exalted, for his obedience, to the glory of God the Father.—ver. 6—11.

* From the manner in which the Respondents managed this quotation, I think they did not do William Penn justice. He says just before:—"1st. We believe him [the Holy One of Israel] to be the Eternal, Incomprehensible, Almighty, Allwise, and Omnipresent God, Creator and Upholder of all things, and that he fills heaven and earth, and that the heaven of heavens cannot contain him." Yet he saith by the Prophet Isaiah, "To that man will I have regard that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and which trembles at my word." It was, therefore, I conceive, this divine Word which he considered as dwelling in Christ Jesus, and as God over all.

names are signed to this paper have been lately brought forward in a periodical publication called "The Monthly Repository," [vol. ix. p. 165,] in order to show that it was not the practice of our early Friends to address their supplications to Christ, but to the Father only. For this purpose the concluding sentences of a collection of their prayers are quoted*. Those who have seen this statement, and are now present, should be informed that these inferences cannot be considered as well founded, because several of the same persons declared their approbation of the paper from which I shall now read one or two passages declarative of the faith of the Society, viz.

"We sincerely profess faith in God, by his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, as being our light and life, our only way to the Father, and also our only Mediator and Advocate with the Father.

"That God created all things, he made the worlds, by his Son Jesus Christ, he being that powerful Word of God by whom all things were made. And that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit are one, in Divine Being inseparable; one true, living and eternal God, blessed for ever.

"Yet that this Word, or Son of God, in the fulness of time took flesh, became perfect man, according to the flesh descended and came of the seed of Abraham and David, but was miraculously conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary. And also further, declared powerfully to be the Son of God, according to the spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection from the dead."

* The concluding sentences of such a collection of prayers as these, afford surely better evidence to whom they were addressed than a paper written to vindicate the Society against charges of heterodoxy by George Keith, who had become, from a zealous Quaker, a professed Trinitarian. The object of this paper was of course to represent the Society as Orthodox as its authors could manage consistent with truth. Yet it approaches no nearer than to exhibit some features of the Sabellian hypothesis.

——— "That the Gospel of the grace of God should be preached in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being one in power, wisdom, and goodness, and indivisible (or not to be divided) in the great work of man's salvation."

"We sincerely confess (and believe in) Jesus Christ, both as he is true God and perfect man, and that he is the Author of our living faith in the power and goodness of God, as manifest in his Son Jesus Christ, and by his own blessed Spirit (or divine unction) revealed in us, whereby we inwardly feel and taste of his goodness, life, and virtue; so as our souls live and prosper by and in him. And the inward sense of this divine power of Christ, and faith in the same, and this inward experience, is absolutely necessary to make a true and perfect Christian in spirit and life.

"That divine honour and worship is due to the Son of God, and that he is, in true faith, to be prayed unto, and the name of the Lord Jesus Christ called upon (as the primitive Christians did) because of the glorious union or oneness of the Son; and that we cannot acceptably offer up prayers and praises to God, nor receive a gracious answer or blessing from God, but in and through his dear Son Christ."—p. 644.*

The Compilers of this confession of the Society's faith refer to texts of Scripture in support of almost every doctrine it contains. We have thought it sufficient to show what its principles are, without going into any formal proof that they are Scriptural. Not that we are indisposed on every proper occasion to bring all the tenets we hold to this test, but because in the discussion of this case it does not appear to be necessary. But as the Appellant has largely quoted the Scriptures in favour

* The extracts from the paper mentioned in the foregoing note were sent, but by whom I know not, to the Monthly Repository. They are inserted, vol. viii. p. 307, in the number for May 1813; and replies to them in pp. 373 and 644 of the same volume. No answer has appeared to either.

of those sentiments, which we object to as unsound, we would show, by adducing a few decisive texts, that we are at least equally disposed to appeal to its authority. Of these, the first we shall refer to is John v. 22, 23, where it is said by Christ himself: "For the Father judgeth no man: but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him*." The Epistle to the Hebrews begins thus: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom he also made the worlds, who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat

* The Respondents, after professing their disposition on every proper occasion to bring all the tenets they hold to the test of Scripture, say: "As the Appellant has so largely quoted the Scriptures in favour of his sentiments, we would show, by adducing a few decisive texts, that we are at least equally disposed to appeal to its authority."

How did they commence this appeal? By quoting two verses, the 22d and 23d of the fifth chapter of John, without saying one syllable about their import, or the context. Now these verses with their context are, in my apprehension, decisively in favour of the proper Unitarian doctrine, and entirely inconsistent with any other. For what do they assert? That the Father—"hath committed all judgment to the Son," that is to that man by whom he will judge the world. The Son of man having received this power, those who honour him not, as having this high office committed to him by the Father, honour not the Father who sent him. That Christ did not mean to assert that equal honour was due to the Son as to the Father, is evident by his declaring in the 19th verse, in reply to the false charge of "making himself equal with God," or rather "like God;"—"Verily, verily I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself." And in the 30th verse he says, "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear I judge: and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me." Can any language more strongly disclaim all underived power than this?

down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father; and he shall be to me a Son. And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him. And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son *he saith:* Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness *is* the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." ch. i. 1—9.*

In the Acts of the Apostles it is said, ch. vii. 59: "And they [the Jews] stoned Stephen invocating (the received Text adds the word *God* in Italics, to denote that it is not found in the Greek), and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." But a few verses before, this protomartyr "being full of the Holy Ghost" is said to have seen Jesus "standing on the right hand of God†." It may

* How any person can attentively read these passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews, without seeing that it was the design of the writer to represent Jehovah the God of their fathers as unrivalled in dignity and power, I cannot imagine. If his Son is said to be "heir of all things," it was by the appointment of God. But what inferences the Respondents meant the Meeting should draw from these texts, as to the charges against me, they did not explain. Some parts of them, as rendered in the received Version, I object to as erroneously translated. And I think the true and most honourable construction that the 9th verse will bear, is, that the Son is there spoken of as one of the human race, but anointed by God "with the oil of gladness" above his fellows, because he "loved righteousness and hated iniquity."

† For what purpose the Respondents quoted this passage their observations upon it did not enable me to discover. If it was to show the propriety of addressing Christ when personally present, or miraculously visible, it was needless, because I had never called it in question. But if this address of Stephen to Jesus, when he ac-

be granted the Appellant that the term rendered 'worship' in the received Version sometimes means only civil respect or obeisance. But we must contend that it much more frequently means adoration, as in Matt. xxviii. 17, where it is said that the disciples, when they saw Jesus after his resurrection, "worshipped him." Nor can this term import less than religious adoration, as it is used Luke xxiv. 52: "And it came to pass while he [Jesus] blessed them, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven, *and they worshipped him*, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy*."

tually saw him, was adduced to prove that we should "offer prayers to him, now he is invisible," I must deny that the example is at all in point, and say with the Editors of the Improved Version, "that it does not authorize the practice."

Lastly, if the Respondents infer from this passage that Jesus was *God over all*, the express testimony of the text is against them. For it states, 1st, That "Stephen saw the glory of God," and 2dly, that he saw Jesus "standing on the right hand of God." Newcome's note on the 59th verse is:—"He called on the Lord Jesus, the vision of whom, ver. 56, seems to have been renewed for the purpose of giving this first Martyr comfort and support."

* The Respondents here grant that the term rendered 'worship' in the received Version, sometimes means only "civil respect or obeisance." Its meaning must therefore be gathered from the occasion on which it is used, and the person to whom it is addressed. "But we must contend," add they, "that it much more frequently means adoration." I shall readily concede this, because in a very great majority of the texts where it occurs, it is directly applied to that great Being who is styled Jehovah in the Old Testament, and the God and Father of Jesus Christ in the New; or in expressly forbidding any other object of adoration. The Respondents, directly after the above just observation, adduce two texts where the term is otherwise applied: viz. Matt. xxviii. 17, and Luke xxiv. 52, in neither of which can I find any thing that indicates, that, as there used, the term means religious adoration. And in the immediate context of each, a circumstance is mentioned which seems to imply that it was not. According to Matthew, on this occasion, "Jesus came near and spake unto them [the eleven disciples], saying, "All power *is given unto me* in heaven and on earth." That is to say, in effect, that all the power he possessed or was destined to exercise as the appointed Mediator, by whom God shall judge the world, was not strictly and properly his own power, or underived. For it was given him. By the terms *all power*, as there used, cannot be intended unlimited power. For the Apostle hath taught us, that

The Apostolic addresses and benedictions may also be said strongly to imply the divinity of Christ and his glorious oneness with the Father*, as in such expressions

when it is said of Christ that "*all things* are subjected under his feet, it is manifest that He is excepted who subjected all things to him—that *God may be all in all.*" And Christ himself testifies that "none knoweth that day and hour" when "the son of man" shall be seen "coming on the clouds with great power and glory—no not the angels that are in heaven, *nor the Son*, BUT THE FATHER."

In citing the passage in Luke the Respondents stopped short at the end of the 52d verse. What their reasons were for not quoting the next and the last verse of this Evangelist I cannot say. I would not however withhold it from my readers. It bears witness in the most conclusive manner, that whatever obeisance or worship the eleven disciples, or those that were with them, offered to Christ on an occasion which cannot occur again, those who paid it "were continually in the Temple, *praising and blessing* GOD."

* "The Apostolic addresses and benedictions," say the Respondents, "*also* imply the divinity of Christ, and his glorious oneness with the Father." These are two propositions neither of which is expressed in Scriptural terms. But from the manner in which the Respondents connect them, I am ready to imagine that all the divinity which they seem in words to ascribe to Christ, they consider as derived from the Father, cautious as they are of expressing themselves plainly on this subject.

But they allege further, that "such expressions as these, 'The *Grace* [or *favour*] of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you,' Rom. xvi. 20, 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; Phil. iv. 23; 1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18, &c. imply the divinity of Christ."

How so? In the first of these texts not Jesus Christ, but another Being who brought him back from the dead, is declared to be the God of Peace, that is, doubtless, the supreme Governor of the Universe.

In the verse which follows the next text selected by the Respondents, Paul says: "My love be with you all in Christ Jesus." But I suppose we are not to infer from this the divinity of the Apostle. I do not say, or think, that the two cases are perfectly similar. In the one the Apostle wishes or prays that the grace or favour of Christ may be with those he addresses, or that they may enjoy all the benefits which the Gospel of Christ is calculated to confer on those who receive his doctrines, and obey his precepts. In the other, the Apostle annexes to his more general benediction a very grateful expression of his personal regard for the Corinthians. And when I reflect that in the 24th verse of the preceding chapter he tells them, that when the end cometh "he [Christ] shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall

as these. "The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you," Rom. xvi. 20. 24. 1 Cor. xvi. 23. Phil. iv. 23.

have put down all rule, and all authority and power," I cannot suppose that the Apostle any more meant to imply the divinity of Christ, by those benedictions from which the Respondents *infer* that doctrine, than he meant to claim such homage as due to himself, or to those for whom he prayed that they "may be filled with all the fulness of God."

The context of Phil. iv. 23 is alike adverse to the inference the Respondents contend for. The Apostle says, a few verses before, "*My God* will supply all your wants—through Christ Jesus. Now unto *our God* and Father *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen." Nor are the two other texts referred to by the Respondents more in their favour.

As to the "Apostolic addresses," the Respondents did not, I think, even cite one as an example. I was not much surprised at this, for no part of the Scriptures exhibit clearer evidence that it was the constant practice of the Apostles themselves, and of the primitive Christian Church, to address their prayers to the God and Father of Jesus Christ, and to offer religious adoration to him only.

In the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and to Philemon, the addresses are almost verbatim the same: viz. "Grace [or favour] be to you, and peace from *God our Father*, and *from* the Lord Jesus Christ." Those in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus are very similar. Such is the constant recognition of *the Father* as GOD in these Apostolic addresses to the Churches, or to individuals; for the Apostles had no secrets in religion, and shunned not openly to declare the whole counsel of God.

Let us now examine the passages immediately connected with these Apostolic addresses, that we may see what these teach us concerning the practice and precepts of the Apostles, as to the proper object of all true worship and supplication. The Apostle says, Rom. i. 8: "I thank *my God* through Jesus Christ for you all." And again, 1 Cor. i. 4: "I thank *my God* always on your account for his favour which is given you through Jesus Christ." It was then the Apostle's constant practice, to thank God as the proper Author and Giver of all Gospel blessings. And very consistently with this he says, 2 Cor. i. 3: "Blessed be *the God* and *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort."

Hence it appears that in the judgement of the Apostle the Father of mercies stood in the relation of the one supreme God, to Jesus Christ, as well as to all the families of the earth, his rational creatures and offspring.

The next Epistle to which the Respondents refer, as containing

1 Thess. v. 28: 2 Thess. iii. 18, &c. To which may be added the Apostle's prayer or ejaculation to Christ,

Apostolic benedictions, begins thus: "Paul an Apostle, not from men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, and *God the Father* who *raised him from the dead*, and all the brethren that are with me, to the Churches of Galatia." Having thus instructed the Galatians by whose power Christ was raised from the dead, the usual benediction follows. The Apostle then proceeds to inform them that Christ "gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world [or age], according to the will of our *God and Father*, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

After the benediction in the following Epistles, the Apostle adds Eph. i. 3: "Blessed be *the God and Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessing in heavenly things through Christ." Phil. i. 3, 6: "I thank *my God* upon every remembrance of you—being confident—that he who hath begun a good work in you will finish it until the day of Jesus Christ." Col. i. 3: "We give thanks to *the God* and *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus." 1 Thess. i. 2, 4: "We give thanks *to God* always for you all, making mention of you in our prayers, remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ before *our God and Father*." And 2 Thess. i. 3: "We ought to *thank God* always for you as it is fit, that your faith increaseth exceedingly, and that the love of every one of you all towards each other aboundeth."

How constantly and emphatically does the Apostle in these Epistles mark the source from whence every spiritual benefit conferred upon mankind by or through Christ Jesus was originally derived. If he had distinctly foreseen the great corruption of the primitive Christian Church which afterwards gradually took place as to the object of worship, he could not have borne his testimony to the Apostolic practice more pointedly and clearly than he has done.

In the first Epistle to Timothy, Paul is said to be "an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the commandment of *God our Saviour*;" and in the 1st verse of the second Epistle, to be "an Apostle, *by the will of God*, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus." In this Epistle also he says that he served or worshipped the same God as his forefathers did, that is Jehovah. ver. 3. In the Epistle to Titus, he styles himself "a servant of God, and an Apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect." These testimonies of the great Apostle of the Gentiles furnish impregnable Scriptural evidence that in the primitive Christian Church the uniform practice was to offer supreme worship to *God the Father only*. But I cannot omit,—long as this note is,—the concurring evidence of

recorded 1 Thess. iii. 11. in these terms: "Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you*."

We may add to these, the testimony of John the Divine, given in the 5th chapter of the Revelations, as to the homage given to "the Lamb—the Lion of the tribe of Judah, by the redeemed of the Lord,—out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." He says, "I beheld and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength, and honour and glory and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, honour, glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." Rev. v. 11, 12, 13.†

the Apostle Peter in his first Epistle. After declaring himself to be "an Apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the foreknowledge of *God the Father*," he adds, ver. 3: "Blessed be *the God and Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead."

* Passing over the foregoing testimonies of the Apostles to their own practice, the Respondents next selected 1 Thess. iii. 11, which they call "the Apostle's *prayer* or *ejaculation* to Christ." It has rather more the appearance of a prayer as rendered in the Improved Version thus—"Now *may* our God and Father himself, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way to you"—than as quoted by the Respondents from the received text. But on what ground they imagine, admitting it to be a prayer, that it was addressed to Christ instead of to God the Father, I cannot imagine; nor did they attempt to explain.

† The Respondents next turned to the 5th chapter of the Apocalypse to show the homage given to the "Lamb—the Lion of the Tribe of Judah." But even this passage, in the most highly figurative and least intelligible book of any in the New Testament, distinguishes most clearly him that sat on the Throne from the Lamb that had been slain. The latter part of the 4th chapter describes

That the great Apostle of the Gentiles was himself in the practice of addressing prayer to Christ, sufficiently appears in 2 Cor. xii. 7, where, after saying "there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure," he adds: "For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me," ver. 8, 9.*

"four-and-twenty Elders" as worshipping the Lord God Almighty—who liveth for ever and ever, and "created all things."

Had the Respondents continued their quotation to the next verse, the last of the chapter, it would have appeared that in this instance also the "Elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever," that is "Him who sat upon the Throne."

"We are not to imagine," says Doddridge, "that the person sitting on the Throne [or the Lamb, he might have added] or, the twenty-four Elders, or the four animals, were real beings, existing in nature; though they represented in a figurative manner things that did really exist. I think it probable that all which passed was in the imagination of St. John."

* The Respondents next selected a text which relates to a subject on which John Locke judiciously observed, "St. Paul having thought fit to conceal it is not easy for those who come after to discover, nor is it much material." It related to something which occurred "above fourteen years" before this Epistle was written. It may however have been well known to those whom he addressed what this "thorn in his flesh" was, but not at all to us. In the ninth chapter of the Acts an account is given of Paul's conversion by means of a miraculous appearance of Jesus to him *in person*, and the conference between them on that occasion. If under any similar circumstances he besought the Lord Jesus thrice that this thorn in the flesh might depart from him, it would be no warrant for our addressing Christ in supplication when not personally present. It is the distinguishing prerogative of the one only true God to be omnipresent and to hear prayer, although he is invisible, whom no man hath seen, or can see.

The Respondents must surely have known that in the language of the sacred writers, when the words "*the Lord*" are used, without any special circumstance denoting otherwise, that they always mean by them either Jehovah in the Old Testament, or the God and Father of Jesus Christ in the New.

Perhaps it is unnecessary to adduce any further proofs that it is lawful to offer worship to the only-begotten Son of God*. But as the Appellant has endeavoured to show † that our ancient and highly respectable friend Richard Claridge "meant no more" by the following passage "than that God was in Christ," I would just read it, to enable the Meeting to judge of its real import, and whether it will admit of such a construction? It is as follows: "We do also believe, that he (Christ) was and is both God and man, in wonderful union, not a God by creation or office, as some [a] hold; nor man by the assumption of a human body only, without a reasonable soul, as others [b]; nor that the manhood was swallowed up of the Godhead, as a third sort [c] grossly fancy; but God uncreated." Claridge's Posthumous Works, p. 441.‡

* By not prefixing the word *supreme* before "*worship*," I am uncertain whether the Respondents meant to assert in this place that it is lawful to offer *supreme worship* "to the only begotten Son of God," the first-born from the dead, or some inferior degree of reverence only.

† Vindication of Scriptural Unitarianism, p. 75.

[a] Arians and Socinians. [b] Apollinarists. [c] Eutychians.

‡ The Respondents should have informed the Meeting that their solitary extract from Claridge was taken from a work of his entitled "An Essay on the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction for the Sins of Mankind; wherein William Penn's book called the Sandy Foundation Shaken is defended—and the vulgar doctrine of Satisfaction *farther refuted* from the testimony of Holy Scripture, and the concurrent opinions of many both ancient and modern writers." This is the "learned Defence" of the Sandy Foundation Shaken, advertised in the first edition of Penn's Works. See the table of contents.

The author's design in writing this "learned defence" of Penn's Work, is much more clearly expressed in many other passages than in the one the Respondents selected. From the obvious general tenor of the Essay, I still think I was warranted in supposing that the author only intended by that passage the plain scriptural doctrine I mentioned. But if I was mistaken, then it may follow that Claridge, construing his expressions very strictly, may have intended in effect to assert the Sabellian doctrine. And it is observable that in a note upon it he disclaims certain opinions of Arians, Socinians, Apollinarists, and Eutychians; but neither here nor elsewhere, so far as I know, (nor any other approved author among

As to the Appellant's assurance that he fully believes all that Christ is recorded in the New Testament to have said coccerning himself and his doctrines, it is not for us to assert the contrary; but it is plain that he differs from us as to the sense in which many important texts of Scripture are to be understood. A profession of agreement with all the doctrines laid down in the Scriptures, is not a sufficient bond of union*. For all Pro-

Friends) casts any censure on those of the Sabellians, with whose opinions he was well acquainted. For he was very conversant with Ecclesiastical history, as his works sufficiently prove.

In his "Essay on the doctrine of the Trinity," after objecting to the Trinitarian hypothesis which supposes that "a different consideration, respect or mode," implies so many distinct and separate persons; he next shows that this leads to the doctrine of three infinite minds, really distinct from each other, in the Godhead; and then says, "Nay, these different considerations, respects or modes of the Godhead, *were owned by the Sabellians of old*, and are not denied by the modern Socinians." Ibid. p. 408.

This work is entitled "An Essay on the doctrine of the Trinity, wherein the various signification of the School terms, viz. the Greek Homoousios, Ousia, Hypostasis, Prosopon, and the Latin Persona, are explicated by good authorities, and the necessity of expressing our belief of the Trinity in plain Scripture terms only *is demonstrated*."

The author, like the celebrated Dr. Samuel Clarke, was a clergyman in the Church of England, but wrote this work long after he had joined the Society of Friends. At this time, it is evident from the whole tenor of the Essay, that he had as much renounced the doctrine of the Trinity, as Dr. Clarke had when he published his famous work entitled "The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity." Yet both of these highly respectable and learned men clung to the name to which they had been accustomed, long after they had relinquished the doctrine it was intended to express. For a brief analysis of this curious and learned work, see Verax's Vindication of Scriptural Unitarianism, pp. 63—69.

* This plea of the Respondents goes the full length of attempting to justify expulsion from Christian fellowship, not for any disbelief of doctrines laid down in the Scriptures, but for a mere difference of opinion, how they are to be understood. And this right is contended for, on behalf of a Society that "requires from its members no subscription to articles of faith," because "it would not be, in its judgement, compatible with the preservation of peace, to insist on such a bond of union." Yet, after making these concessions at an early part of their reply, do the Respondents near

testants profess to appeal to the Scriptures in defence of their various and opposite principles; and we might as well retain persons in membership who hold that oaths and war are lawful to Christians, as those who do not believe the eternal divinity of that power which *dwelt* in Christ Jesus*.

its close contend for this right of expulsion, not on the comparatively reasonable and just ground of the breach of articles previously made known and agreed on, but on the vague and dangerous principle of investing every particular Monthly Meeting, however small or weak, with a discretionary power of judging its members on points of faith, without any acknowledged standard or law for either party to appeal to. The exercise of "this power may be safely lodged in their hands," say the Respondents, "subject to the important privilege of appeal;" that is, to such checks as it may happen to secure to an individual in so hopeless a contest with Church authority.

How very differently William Penn thought on this subject, let the following extract evince. I might adduce many more from his Works equally strong, but this may suffice. He says, vol. i. p. 747, "The Scripture is the great record of truth, that which all these parties in controversy agree to be the declared mind and will of God, and unanimously say it ought to be believed and professed as such. If this be true, in what language can we so safely and properly declare our belief of those truths as in the very language of the Scripture?—I must say it is preposterous, and a contradiction, that those who desire to deliver their *faith* of *truth*, in the *language* of *truth*, shall not be reputed true believers, nor their faith admitted. —It seems then we must not express our belief of God *in his words*, but our own; nor is the *Scripture* a *Creed* plain or proper enough to declare a true believer, or an orthodox Christian, without our glosses.

"Are not things come to a sad pass, that to refuse any other terms than those the Holy Ghost has given us, and which are confessed to be the rule or form of sound words, is to expose a man to the censure of being *unsound* in the faith, and unfit for Christian communion? Will nothing do but *man's comment* instead of *God's text?* His consequences and conclusions in the room of *sacred revelation?* I cannot see how any man can be obliged to receive, or believe revealed truths, in any other language than that of the revelation itself; especially if those that vary the expression, have not the same spirit to lead them in so doing, or, *that it appears not to me that they have.*"

* Perhaps you might even "as well retain persons in membership who hold oaths and war to be lawful to Christians, as those who do not believe the eternal divinity of that power which *dwelt in Christ*

Far different from this did our early Friends understand those texts which speak of the creation of all things by Jesus Christ, whether they be thrones, principalities, or powers—of his thinking it no robbery to be equal with God—the brightness of his glory—the heir of all things—to whom is *jointly with the Father* to be ascribed all power, dominion, and glory, for ever and ever*.

We may now conclude by observing that we have no doubt but it will be clear to the Yearly Meeting that

Jesus." But this case is not in point. The Respondents well knew I never hesitated to acknowledge this. All divine power, strictly speaking, is eternal. It could not otherwise be divine; for all that is in the highest sense divine, is unchangeable and underived. It was not this, but the eternal divinity and omnipotence of Jesus Christ which my accusers and judges disowned me for not holding, as their own records will prove. And that too, refusing to say whether they meant to apply those terms to the man Christ Jesus, or to that divine power which dwelt in him; nor have I been since informed during any part of the discussion. Even the Respondents refused me this explanation, and yet at the close of their reply, scruple not in the above disingenuous manner to insinuate that I disbelieved what I have in their presence uniformly and repeatedly acknowledged.

* In this concluding profession of the Respondents' faith, they appear to me to have stumbled upon the language, not of Scripture, but of Roman missals, or Prayer-books. After quoting in a very confused manner sundry scraps of texts, the last of which (from Heb. i. 1,) describes the Son of God as "the heir of all things," they add, without the shadow of any Scriptural authority for the use of such language, "to whom is *jointly with the Father* to be ascribed *all power*, *dominion*, and *glory*, for ever and ever."

This is to assert a strict co-equality between the Son and the Father, which is a doctrine that I cannot receive at the hands of any Church; and if the Respondents were warranted in representing it as a doctrine of the Society of Friends, while I lament so great a departure from the primitive simplicity of their Christian faith, and from that of the New Testament, I shall never regret being set free from the imputation of holding a doctrine so derogatory, as I deem it, to the honour due to the most high God, "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honour and power everlasting."

the Appellant does not hold these important doctrines of the Society, but has aided in propagating opposite doctrines, and that the Monthly Meeting was justified in disowning him; and that it was the duty of the Quarterly Meeting, whose decision we are appointed to defend, after hearing the parties on his appeal, to confirm the said judgement.

The Respondents concluded their reply about the time the Meeting usually adjourns, and near an hour later than it sat the day before. A proposal to adjourn was accordingly made by one of its members. The Meeting should have judged of this without any interference by the Respondents; but two of them objected to it very earnestly. Luke Howard said, "It will be better for the Meeting to sit till ten at night, than to adjourn before both parties have been fully heard. If the Meeting adjourns for the convenience of the Appellant, the Respondents will expect and claim the same indulgence. And if so, it is not easy to say how long the sittings of the Meeting may be protracted." The motion for an adjournment was so slightly supported, that confident as I felt that if I urged it, the clerk would second my claim as just and reasonable, I concluded to wave it, and then addressed the Meeting nearly in the following terms:—

It was wisely observed by John Locke, that as truth "can receive no evidence from our passions or interests, so it should receive no tincture from them."—"I think there is (says he) one unerring mark of the love of truth, namely, the not entertaining any proposition with greater assurance than the proofs it is built upon will warrant." Essay on Enthusiasm, sect. 1.

In a small tract entitled "Thoughts on Reason and Revelation," by our friend Joseph Gurney Bevan, he has shown how injudicious it is to decry the use of reason in matters of religion; and the justly celebrated author I first adverted to, having in a very few words most clearly pointed out the connexion between those two inestima-

ble gifts, and the source of both, I would earnestly recommend the passage to your attention. It is this: "Reason is natural revelation, whereby the eternal Father of light and Fountain of all knowledge communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties.

"Revelation is natural reason enlarged by a new set of discoveries, communicated by God immediately, which reason vouches the truth of, by the testimony and proofs it gives that they come from God. So that he that takes away *reason* to make way for *revelation* does much the same as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope." Ibid. sect. 4. or Essay on the Human Understanding, b. 4. c. 19. sect. 4.

How far my accusers have acted upon similar principles I will not say; but I cannot help expressing my very great surprise that they should have produced and read to you the 4th rule in the Book of Extracts, under the head Meetings for Discipline, as sanctioning the proceedings they have been appointed to defend. Is it then to be taken for granted that those proceedings were founded in "*the power and wisdom of God*"? The use of such expressions in the Minute of 1703 may be evidence of the persuasion spoken of, viz. that such was "*the authority of those Meetings*," but none at all of the grounds whereon that persuasion rested. "Men may be as positive and as peremptory in error as in truth."

Similar language I am aware was often used very indiscreetly by some of our early authors; but I little expected this Minute would have been quoted as conferring a discretionary power, and a consequent qualification on inferior Meetings to judge of matters of faith and worship, in cases to which it is admitted that no rule applies—to cases, too, that have been of very rare occurrence, and might therefore, as well as for many other reasons, be much more safely left to their own operation. It behoves the Meeting deeply to consider

how dangerous such a precedent for the exercise of Church authority may become.

I suppose the Respondents and many other persons now present must have seen a letter of Henry Tuke's, in the Christian Observer for Feb. last, [Vol. 13, pp. 95—100] and the reply to it by the Editors of that work. If they have read the latter with attention, I think they could not need any further proof that the writings of such of our early Friends as are held in the highest esteem contain many passages which no man of a sober judgement and sound understanding would now venture to defend. I have the number by me, and could soon satisfy the Meeting of this by reading a few passages extracted from George Fox's Journal. But I forbear; and shall only add, that although I was previously acquainted with most, if not all the passages they have selected, I know nothing of the writer, nor did I of the article, till some time after it was published. I am sorry it did not teach the Respondents more prudence, than to set up this inapplicable and unwarranted pretension in favour of Church authority.

As to the quotations they adduced from works circulated and sold by the London Unitarian Book Society, after repeating the solemn protest I made yesterday, I have only to add that, so far as I am acquainted with the sentiments of its members, they would to a man spurn the idea as absurd and unfounded; that they were individually accountable for all that the works in its catalogue may contain. Nor would I accept membership in any religious society upon similar conditions.

It is not a little singular and inconsistent, that although the Respondents have contended for subjecting me to this rigid responsibility, they have in your presence described writings which have been sanctioned by the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders (when I have appealed to such works), as containing only the sentiments of individuals, and not those of the Society. But when they adduce any part of the same, or other writings

in their favour, they have held them up as almost of divine authority. See pp. 51—62. 70—76. 83—88. and 96.

Yet the new Tract Association among Friends is not founded on the principle of making its members personally responsible for the soundness of all that its tracts may contain. There is even a provision in its rules for the casual introduction of error in the works it publishes, which are to be "suspended," or suppressed "when called upon" either by the Meeting for Sufferings, or the Morning Meeting!

Our Book Association is founded on very different, and on much more liberal principles. Its members set up no other writings than the Scriptures in a correct text or translation, as of decisive authority in matters of faith and worship, and are for bringing all to the test of Christ's own doctrine. They are also firmly persuaded that free discussion can never be ultimately unfavourable to the interests of truth and genuine Christianity.

In my address to the Meeting yesterday, after quoting the saying of Christ "*I am the Son of God*," John x. 36, I added, "That is *the Christ*, or *the Messiah*." This the Meeting will recollect one of the Respondents asserted to be "*a false gloss*," and has since twice repeated the accusation in a tone and manner calculated to make an impression not merely that I was in error, but that I was wilfully attempting to impose upon the Meeting what I knew to be a perversion of the text. Yet I trust the Respondent could not intend to hold me up as capable of such a crime.

Luke Howard here very fully disclaimed any such intention, adding, "As I retract those words, I hope the Appellant will be satisfied with this acknowledgment, and say no more on this subject."

The clerk said, The Appellant is quite in order, and must be heard; and I think it is proper to add, that he set the Respondents a good example, which they would

have done well to follow, for I believe he did not once attempt to interrupt them during the whole of their reply. They had better make minutes of any thing they may wish to add, and may afterwards claim a hearing.

I resumed, saying, I am fully satisfied with the Respondent's explanation with regard to my intentions; but as the text in question is, as he observed, a very important one, like many others of similar purport, and he still appears to think me in a dangerous error concerning its meaning, and called upon me before the Committee to produce my authorities; I am now prepared to show that if I am in error, I have missed the true import of the text in very good company. For John Locke, in his "Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures," has conclusively shown, that such is the usual import of those terms as used by the writers of the New Testament. A few extracts will I believe suffice to establish this.

He says, "It appears by John i. 41, that *the Messiah* being interpreted, is *the Christ*. I have therefore, for the clearer understanding of the Scripture, all along put *Messiah* for *Christ:* Christ being but the Greek name for Messiah, and both signifying *the Anointed.*" Works, vol. ii. p. 518; or, his Reasonableness of Christianity, p. 23.

Again, says Locke, still making the Scripture its own interpreter, "That believing him (Christ) to be the Son of God and to be the Messiah was the same thing, may appear by comparing John i. 45 with ver. 49, where Nathaniel owns Jesus to be the Messiah in these terms: 'Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.' So the Jews, Luke xxii. 70, asking Christ whether he were the Son of God, plainly demand of him whether he were the Messiah." Ibid. p. 518. or p. 26.

After many other scriptural proofs that these are convertible terms, having in the sense of the sacred writers the same meaning, Locke adds, "I desire any one to read the latter part of the 1st of John from ver. 25,

with attention, and tell me whether it be not plain that this phrase *the Son of God* is an expression used for *the Messiah*. To which let him add Martha's declaration of her faith, John xi. 27, in these words; 'I believe that thou art *the Messiah*, THE SON OF GOD, who should come into the world;' and that passage of St. John xx. 31. 'That ye might believe that Jesus is *the Messiah*, THE SON OF GOD; and that believing ye might have life through his name;' and then tell me whether he can doubt that *Messiah* and *Son of God* were synonymous terms at that time among the Jews." Ibid. p. 523. or p. 38.

I shall only cite one more passage to prove that my comment on John x. 36 was no false gloss in the estimation of so accurate a reasoner and sincere a Christian as John Locke. After quoting John vii. 31, "And many of the people believed in him (Jesus), and said, When the Messiah cometh will he do more miracles than this man hath done? And when the Jews at the feast of dedication, John x. 24, 25, coming about him, said unto him, 'How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Messiah, tell us plainly;' Jesus answered them, 'I told you and ye believed not; the works that I do in my Father's name bear witness of me.' And John v. 36, he says 'I have greater witness than that of John; for the works which the Father hath given me to do, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.' Where by the way we may observe, that his being 'sent by the Father' is but another way of expressing the Messiah; which is evident from this place, John v. compared with that of John x. last quoted. For there he says, that his works bear witness of him. And what is that witness? viz. 'That the Father sent him.' By which we are taught, that to be sent by the Father, and to be the Messiah, was the same thing, in his way of declaring himself." Ibid. p. 525. or p. 42, 43.

If William Penn be deemed in this assembly higher

authority as an expositor of Scripture than his illustrious friend John Locke, I might refer to many passages in his writings in support of the same conclusion. One only may suffice. "What of the Christian dispensation is so peculiar and important, as to challenge of right the name of Creed?" Having put this question, he answers it thus: "I say then, that the belief of Jesus of Nazareth to be the promised Messiah, the Son and Christ of God, come and sent from God to restore and save mankind, is the first, and was then the only requisite article of faith—and this may be proved both by example and doctrine.

"It is evident from example, as in the case of Peter, who for having believed in his heart and confessed with his mouth that Jesus was the Christ and Son of God, obtained that signal blessing: Matt. xvi. This made Nathaniel a disciple; Rabbi, said he, 'thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.'—This was also the substance of Martha's confession of faith to Jesus, when he said to her, 'I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me shall never die; believest thou this?' She answered, 'Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, *the Son of God*, which should come into the world.' She answered him not as to—the resurrection, but—that he was *the Christ*, *the Messiah*, that was to come into the world, *and that sufficed.*"

After adducing many other examples, he says; "This was the main bent of Peter's sermon; and when the three thousand believed that he whom the Jews had crucified was both Lord and Christ, and repented of their sins, and gladly received his word, they are said to have been in a state of salvation." Penn concludes the examples he adduces by saying, "Thus we may plainly see that they were baptized into the faith of Jesus, and not into numerous opinions; and that this one confession from true faith in the heart was the ground and principle of their church fellowship. Then (adds he) God's Church was at peace; she throve; there

were then no snares of words to catch men of conscience with. Then not many words, but much integrity: now much talk and little truth. Many articles, but O ye of little faith!

"Nor was this only the judgement and practice of that time out of condescension to weakness, and charity to ignorance; for both Christ Jesus himself and his Apostles have doctrinally laid it down as the great test to Christians; that which should—justly entitle them to his discipleship, and Christian communion one with another.

"Let us read a little further. Then said they to Jesus, What shall we do that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered, 'This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom God hath sent.' And upon another occasion he said to the Jews, 'For if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.' It must follow, then, that if they did believe him to be *the Messiah, the anointed of God* to salvation, they should be saved."

After several other Scriptural proofs, Penn says, "I will conclude these doctrinal testimonies out of Scripture with a conclusive passage, John xx. 30, 31; in which place two things are remarkable: 1st, That whatever things are written of Jesus, are written to this end, that we might believe that *Jesus* is *the Christ*. 2d, That those that sincerely believe, shall through him obtain eternal life. Certainly then if this be true, their presumption must be great who have—set another rule of Christianity than Jesus and his apostles gave. This sincere confession contented Christ and his apostles; but it will not satisfy those that yet pretend to believe them.—A man may sincerely believe this, and be stigmatized for a schismatic, a heretic, an excommunicate; but I may say, as Christ did to the Jews in another case, From the beginning it was not so." Penn's Works, vol. i. pp. 754—756.

Such is the substantial agreement of these truly great men, as to the Scriptural import of those terms, as used

by the sacred writers, for adopting which I have been so repeatedly held up to you as putting a false and a dangerous gloss on an important text of Scripture. If the Respondents, after attentively considering this evidence, are still of the same opinion, I hope they will in their rejoinder distinctly state upon what grounds they adhere to it.

With regard to the numerous quotations adduced by them from the writings of our early Friends, in order to show what the doctrines of the Society are, I think they might have been much more pertinently quoted to prove the variety of sentiment that existed among them, and that they liberally allowed, and encouraged each other in the free exercise of the rights of private judgement. The lateness of the hour will not admit of it, or the minutes I made during the reply of the Respondents would readily enable me to show this, by comparing their quotations with each other. I shall therefore only observe, that those quotations appear to me to agree on no point of much importance to the questions at issue, that none of them assert a belief in the doctrine of a distinction of persons in the Deity, which all real Trinitarians profess to hold in some sense or other.

This I take to be the precise line which distinguishes their faith from that of Unitarians. To which class then did our predecessors most properly belong? Plainly to the latter. Nor has one of my accusers or judges, to my knowledge, ventured to overstep the boundary line. They profess indeed to believe the divinity of Christ, but will not plainly and distinctly say whether they mean the divinity of his person, of the man Christ Jesus, or of that divine power which dwelt in and acted by him. I suppose, the latter only*. The Overseers of the Monthly Meeting, and its Committee, at their first conference with me, distinctly admitted that they never

* See the conclusion of the Respondents' reply, p. 66, which seems to indicate a leaning that way, although they did not choose to speak out plainly.

understood it was ascribed by Friends to the man Christ Jesus. But from this time they disingenuously refused saying to whom they believed this divinity of right belongs.

Although the minute appointing this Committee is drawn up in the most indefinite terms, to which I strongly objected at the time, the present Respondents, without attempting to refute those objections, have thought fit to say, that "whether they are well-founded or not is of little consequence." I trust you will see, if they do not, the danger of such a precedent. Is it then of no consequence whether the first official record against an accused person truly describes the imputed offence? Or, whether it subjects him to indefinite degrees of tale-bearing and detraction, and to the consequent decision of prejudiced judges?

By the Report of the said Committee they paid me two visits "*to no satisfaction.*" For this, however, a very intelligible cause is assigned. "We questioned him," say this Committee, "on some important points of doctrine, respecting which we had strong ground *to believe* his opinions are at variance with those of the Society; to which he decidedly refused to answer." I did so, not because I was ashamed or afraid to avow any doctrine which I believed, or to disavow any which I did not believe; but because I was firmly persuaded the assumption of such an inquisitorial authority ought to be steadily opposed. It is for you to decide on the propriety of sanctioning the exercise of such powers by delegates of the Church.

The Respondents have admitted that the proceedings in this, and in some other respects, do not appear *on the face of the Meeting's records*, to be such as they "could have wished." The inquisitorial character of the visits of this Committee is briefly but accurately marked in their Report. While the faculty of memory lasts I shall never forget that this formed the most prominent and distinguishing feature of their visits. But although in

this instance the Committee have stated the true character of its proceedings, which the Respondents did not venture to justify, it is obvious that the same conduct may be pursued in other cases, and no trace of it appear on the Meeting's records. It is the thing itself which it behoves you as a Protestant Church to guard against, and not the exposure of such a practice.

The next complaint in this document is, that I refused to say whether I had written certain works under the signature of "Verax?" I did so, because the Committee had no right under the terms of their appointment to make this inquiry. For although the minute was expressed in the most indefinite terms, being present when it was drawn up I knew that it had no reference to those writings. After grossly mis-stating the apparent scope of Verax's publications, the Report accuses me of having "distributed some papers entitled Remarks on the Quakers' Yearly Epistle calling in question the omnipotence of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the propriety of applying to him in secret supplication as professed by the Yearly Meeting in its Epistle for 1810," also that I am "a member of the Unitarian Society" in which I confess to have "great satisfaction."

Such are the charges on which the Monthly Meeting directed "a testimony of denial" to be drawn up against me. As to the first of these accusations, I trust I have already sufficiently vindicated the propriety of bringing one of your Epistles *to the test of Scripture.* The Respondents appear indeed to have tacitly admitted the futility of this accusation, and of that which related to the writings of Verax, by saying, after enumerating the recorded charges against me, that they deemed one of these of itself sufficient to justify disownment; viz. my becoming a member of the London Unitarian Book Society. And if I had thereby bound myself to an approval of all that the works in its catalogue may contain, as they groundlessly imagined, it might perhaps

have warranted their conclusion. For it would have been virtually to renounce the paramount authority of the Scriptures, which it is the great and the professed object of this Association to support; or, in other words, to incite the attention of men to the genuine doctrines of revelation, as delivered in the Scriptures.

I must repeat that a fresh charge is brought forward in the testimony of disownment. It says, I have "joined a Society who publicly avow their disbelief of the eternal divinity of Jesus Christ our Lord," and that this appears from their Committee's Report. Yet neither of these assertions is true; and so sensible were the Respondents of this, that they shrunk back, and contented themselves with observing "that the Committee expressed themselves *as they thought correctly.*" I admit this, and offered them an opportunity of correcting it as an inadvertent but *actual error.* They rejected this offer. The Respondents have called upon you, as I also do, to judge whether what is said in the testimony of denial be warranted, or not.

William Tuke observed that much of what the Appellant had now said should have been alleged yesterday or not at all. In this stage of the proceedings he ought to be heard only in reply to the Respondents' address. The clerk desired me to proceed.

At an early part of my address to the Meeting yesterday morning, I described Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken, as asserting in the plainest and most unequivocal terms the same doctrines which I am accused of having imbibed and aided in propagating. I did not attempt any formal proof of their consonancy, because that has been in fact admitted. Even the Respondents have shown by a passage which they read from Penn's Works [vol. ii. p. 453], that five years after that work was published, he strenuously denied that the Apology for that work entitled Innocency with her open Face was "*a Retraction,*" as his friend Thomas Firmin would have it to be. It is evident therefore that the

Author at the time he wrote those works, and as long after as we know any thing of his sentiments respecting them, thought them consistent with each other. Not a syllable is to be found in the latter implying that there are any erroneous doctrines in the former. Yet it appears, as I have long since publicly stated, that William Penn held in some sense or other the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and that he considered that tenet to be consistent with a total enervation of the doctrine of "the Trinity of separate persons in the unity of essence," of "God's incapacity to forgive, without the fullest satisfaction paid him by another," and of "a justification of impure persons by an imputative righteousness." These principles were in his estimation "not more repugnant to Scripture Reason and souls security, than most destructive to God's honour, in his unity, mercy, and purity."

In short, so decidedly is the Sandy Foundation Shaken admitted to be in my favour, that the Author of a late work sanctioned by the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders represents the readers of the last edition of that work, as introduced to the writings of William Penn "only through the medium of Unitarian quotation." That is, if there be any meaning in words, that it is wholly of that complexion and character.

The Respondents should therefore have attempted to show, either that it is actually expressed in ambiguous language, as they alleged without the shadow of proof, or, that the Society had never sanctioned this work. These alternatives would be equally difficult. A slight examination of this tract would be sufficient to show that it is remarkably distinguished among all the Author's doctrinal works for definite language and perspicuity of expression. And as to the manner in which the Society have given their sanction to it as a sound doctrinal tract, it may suffice to say that Richard Claridge's learned defence of it was published under the Society's patronage above fifty years after it was first printed.

Or, lastly, the Respondents should have attempted to make out its consistency with the passages they adduced from the writings of approved Authors, and its discordance with the doctrines they impute to me as erroneous. Neither of these positions have they even aimed to establish. If this work cannot be reconciled with the Apology for it, as Joseph Gurney Bevan under the signature of "Vindex" maintained, what is the just inference, from this view of the subject? Surely this: That our Ancestors in religious profession, extended a liberal toleration to its members on points of faith and worship. The system of discipline which they established was professedly founded on this principle.

It was my intention to have referred to the several articles of my Appeal one by one, in order distinctly to show how very few of its allegations the Respondents have examined, much less refuted*; but the lateness of the hour and the restlessness of the Meeting prevent my entering upon it in the manner I proposed. I shall

* One of the Respondents, George Stacey, whose speech in the Quarterly Meeting is given at p. 352 of my Narrative, is since deceased, and I bear a willing testimony to the general excellence of his character. William Allen, another of the Respondents, is *second to none* within my knowledge for his enlightened and active zeal in the promotion of philanthropic objects for the improvement of the great mass of Society in moral and intellectual attainments. My Narrative records, p. 358—362, the prominent and influential part he took in the discussion of my case in the Quarterly Meeting; and having subsequently accepted the office of Respondent on this occasion, it may appear singular that a man of his acknowledged talents should not have taken an equally leading part under that appointment. I cannot account for this: but the fact is, he was totally silent upon the subject when it was before the Yearly Meeting, and only spoke once during the time it was before the Committee of Appeals, and then very briefly and in general terms, saying that the matters at issue between me and the Society *turned on one or two points only*, which were necessary to be noticed by Friends, as I had *openly avowed my sentiments on them.* I requested that he would in justice to me state what he considered these *one or two points were*, so many charges having been as he knew alleged against me. But although I earnestly and repeatedly pressed it, *he declined all explanation.*

therefore only refer it to your deliberate attention, and observe that in the first section of it I have endeavoured to exhibit a correct but brief view of that conduct for which I have incurred the censure of my brethren. I stated this conduct as clearly as was in my power, because in point of fact I hold myself amenable to you on those two points only, as these were the only grounds on which I was recorded as a delinquent on the books of the Monthly Meeting. I have uniformly protested against the introduction of any other matter of crimination, during an inquiry into these, as irrelevant and unjust.

It is true I was unable to repress that restless disposition which prompted the reiterated production of one accusation after another, during the whole course of the proceedings; and neither the Monthly nor the Quarterly Meeting, nor the Committee of the latter would lend any assistance to restrain my accusers to the ground they had originally chosen.

Of course I claimed the right of rebutting these fresh charges, so far as I thought necessary. In so doing, however, I did not admit, nor do I now, the propriety of producing these supplementary accusations, whether they are well or ill founded; and I respectfully protest against your right under this Appeal to take into consideration as matter of accusation against me, any other than those charges which were first alleged against me, and on which I was in fact put upon my trial.

Considering, therefore, that one is our Master even Christ, and that one is our Father, who is in Heaven, even God, and that we all are brethren not authorized to sit in judgement on each other's faith towards God, I do not call upon you to decide upon mine, as it would be in my mind to ask you to assume such power as no Protestant Church can consistently exercise.

But I do earnestly solicit you deliberately to examine the real character of the proceedings against me, and impartially to determine between the parties, not as a question of private concern, but of public interest to

the future welfare of the Society. In the discharge of this duty, you will decide whether, in your opinion, I have so far exceeded the proper limits of those unalienable rights of private judgement, which it becomes every Christian to claim and exercise, as justly to have subjected me to expulsion from religious fellowship; whether the proceedings have been just and equitable, regular and orderly, conformable to your own rules, and consistent with the liberal unchangeable maxims and divine spirit of the Gospel.

However you may determine this question, I trust ever to feel anxious for the promotion of those great and benevolent principles of our common Christianity, which our ancestors so nobly asserted, and for which the Society are still conspicuous advocates. For after all, these constitute much of the essence of all true Religion, breathing in unison with the recorded song of the heavenly host, "*Glory to God in the highest*, and on earth peace, good-will towards men."

Soon after I sat down, the Clerk asked the Respondents and myself whether we had any thing farther to offer to the Meeting? We both answered we had not. The Meeting adjourned a little after nine to the next morning at ten.

YEARLY MEETING, 5th Month, 26th, 1814.

Soon after the Meeting assembled I sent in the following note by one of the door-keepers:

"*To the Yearly Meeting.*

"Your Appellant, Thomas Foster, respectfully informs you that he shall be in waiting, in order to be called in to hear in the presence of the Respondents, from "the Committee of Appeals" by "two of their number," appointed and reported to you for that purpose, an explanation of "the grounds of their decision," at such time

as you may deem most proper, in conformity to the 7th rule respecting Appeals made last year.

"Bromley, May 26, 1814."

On this note and the rule to which it refers being read by the Clerk, a discussion took place whether the rule to which it refers should be complied with, or not. This subject occupied the Meeting, I understand, near an hour. I was informed of the result by the following minute:

"*To Thomas Foster, the Appellant.*

"Yearly Meeting, 5th Day Morning, 5th Month, 26th, 1814.

"This Meeting does not think it necessary to call upon the deputation of the Committee on the Appeal, to give it any explanation of the grounds of that Committee's decision, *in the present stage of the business;* and is of the judgement that it does not rest with either the Appellant or the Respondents to call for such explanation at any time.

"John Wilkinson, Clerk."

After this question was *thus* disposed of, the Meeting proceeded to consider the case before it. I have been favoured by some of my friends who were present with the following outlines of the discussion†.

** John Tucket, Jun.—"I have earnestly desired that on this occasion we might all *settle down in our own minds*, and if any man speak, *let him speak as the Oracle of God*‡."

† All the speakers on this discussion, who are known to me as *Ministers* or *Elders*, or have been reported to me as such, have asterisks prefixed to their names:—to the former *two*, to the latter *one only*.

‡ The text here alluded to 1 Pet. iv. 11, says, "If any man speak, let him speak as the Oracles of God," that is, according to

The requisite qualification for speaking to the subject being defined in these terms, the discussion commenced, and was continued, I am credibly informed, till no less than thirty persons had spoken; none of whom thought fit to disclaim the flattering but delusive implied compliment of speaking "*as the Oracle of God.*" Yet I do not suppose that the clerk, or the more judicious part of the assembly, could approve such a misapplication of the text.

* 1. William Alexander, of York.—"I think the subject should be divided into two parts: 1st, Whether the nature of the offence was sufficient to justify the proceedings of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting in disowning the Appellant? 2d. Whether the decision of the Quarterly Meeting confirming those proceedings was justifiable? Admitting these to have been regular, I think the conduct of the Appellant warranted his disownment."†

** 2. William Grover, of Stanstead, Essex.—"I am thankful that Friends have been preserved in a good degree of patience during the investigation of the subject before the Meeting, and am of opinion that the principles of Thomas Foster are not consistent with those of Friends, and therefore approve the decision of the Committee."

the doctrine which they teach. Instead of this wholesome and important injunction of the Apostle, another is substituted of a very different import, according to which every person who spoke on this occasion was enjoined to speak as an *Oracle of the Most High.* I fear many members of this Society so misunderstand the text. I have commonly heard it quoted in this erroneous manner by its approved ministers.

† This Friend lately published, in his "Annual Monitor for 1816," a creed *as coinciding with his own,* which Creed had been inserted, verbatim, in the Monthly Repository for Feb. 1813, vol. viii. p. 110, "in order to show what sort of a Trinity it is, which at least some highly accredited members of this Society profess to believe;" and that "it only supplies a pretence for the use of orthodox language while *the real doctrine is strictly Unitarian.*" It is, however, eminently defective as a Christian profession of faith, inasmuch as it is wholly silent concerning "*the history, doctrine, death, or resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.*" See also the number for Feb. 1816, vol. xi. p. 88.

** 3. John Bateman, of Chatteris.—"I fully approve the Report of the Committee, and all the proceedings of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting."

*4. Richard Ball, of Bridgewater.—"I apprehend that John Bateman could not mean to express his approbation of all the proceedings of that Meeting, but rather of its decision and of that of the Committee."

5. expressed his unity with the decision of the Committee †.

** 6. Morris Birkbeck, of Guildford.—"I have been absent from several of the sittings of the Meeting, but I cordially unite with the judgement of the Committee."

* 7. Thomas Sparkes, of Exeter.—"I approve the Report of the Committee."

** 8. William Martin, of Lewes.—"I also approve the Committee's Report, and believe the Appellant is not one with Friends in their belief concerning the divinity of Christ, and that he was not influenced by affection for the Society in prosecuting his appeal, but by a desire to disseminate his own opinions‡."

** 9. John Wilkinson, of High Wycombe, (*the Clerk*). —"I wish Friends would avoid judging the Appellant as to his motives, whatever they may think of his opinions, as being different from ours. I must in justice to him say that I feel a full conviction of his sincerity, which there appears no reason to call in question."

* 10. William Tuke, of York.—"I unite in the sentiments of the Friends who have spoken before me, but am of opinion that the Appellant has imbibed sentiments

† After the numerals at the beginning of every speech, the name of the Friend being unknown, a space is left for its insertion in *MS.* in the copies of such of my readers as may be able and choose to supply the deficiencies. None of the speakers were *members* of London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting.

‡ Surely a little reflection might have convinced this Friend that a desire to disseminate opinions which the Appellant believed to be true and highly important, amongst the members of the Society, was rather a proof of his affection for them than of any opposite feeling.

of Socinianism which cannot be tolerated by the rules of the Society§."

11. —" I concur with the Report of the Committee."

*12. Richard Ball proposed the Report of the Committee to be read; which was accordingly read by the Clerk.

13. " It does not appear to me that the Appellant prosecuted his Appeal from a regard for the principles or the reputation of the Society, and I approve the judgement of the Quarterly Meeting."

14.

15. declared they approved the judgement of the Committee.

16. John Mackellow, of Maidstone.—" I think it is my duty to inform the Meeting that a young man has been taking notes of what has been said. While I am upon my feet I would just say, and I am *proud* to say it, that I approve the decision of the Committee. Truth has at last conquered, as it ever will do ‖."

§ There is nothing definite in this charge: the same accusation was brought against William Penn, to which after him I reply, as to the opinions of Socinus, " If in any thing I acknowledge the verity of his doctrine, it is for the truth's sake, of which he had a clearer prospect than most of his cotemporaries."

But Socinus was a persecutor. " He approved and connived at, if he did not procure, the imprisonment of Francis Davides, for the honest avowal of his opinion that Socinus was inconsistent, and went contrary to Scripture, in contending for the worship of the man Christ Jesus." See Aspland's Plea for Unitarian Dissenters, first edit. p. 73. It is therefore both absurd and unjust to impute Socinianism to those who disclaim this distinguishing tenet of the sect, and adhere to the opposite doctrine of the more consistent Davides—that religious worship should only be offered to *God the Father*.

‖ This speech betrays a "*proud*" feeling, which may have actuated other speakers also. The occasion afforded them an opportunity not to be let slip, of proclaiming their approval of the Committee's decision, and of thereby implying their own orthodoxy without assigning any reasons for the judgement they pronounced.

The triumph of Church power appears more likely to give birth for such feelings, than the simple love of truth for its own sake, and to that of the Gospel.

* 17. Thomas Maw, of Needham.—"I am of opinion that the Appellant has failed in proving his coincidence with the doctrines of the Society, but has cooperated with the Unitarian Society, disbelieves the Divinity of Christ, and has imbibed other principles different from those of Friends. I therefore approve the judgement of the Committee."

* 18. Thomas Davis, of Minehead—

19. John Nevins, of Leeds—and

* 20. William Tuke—further reprobated the conduct of the young man who was taking notes. The latter proposed that he should be *shown the door*, adding "I suppose he is not a member of the Meeting, but sat there *only by sufferance* †."

† This Elder, in his zeal to prevent these proceedings from transpiring, seems to have forgotten that every member of the Society possesses a prescriptive title to those rights he would represent as held only by the *sufferance* of the privileged orders. They are founded on the common Law, and the uniform practice of Friends, for more than a century. The queries as much enjoin as a duty the general attendance of meetings for discipline, as those for worship. The Yearly Meeting has long been in the regular practice of appointing Friends on its Committees, who were neither representatives, ministers, nor members of the Meeting for Sufferings. The Yearly Meeting is no doubt said by the minute of 1801 to "*consist* of representatives from every Quarterly Meeting in Great Britain," &c. and of such men ministers "*as are in Town*," in order to ensure a competent attendance to proceed to business, *but not to the exclusion of any other members of the Society*. If such were its proper construction, *even Elders*, the highest order among Friends, those who are appointed to have the oversight of the ministry, *would have no right to be present in the Yearly Meeting*, much less to partake in its deliberations. Their title to either is not *as Elders*, but merely *as members of the Society*, in common with the rest of their brethren. Yet are the latter now told that they sit in the Yearly Meeting *merely "by sufferance!"* This unfounded notion could hardly have arisen among that class of the Society which is still directed by an express rule to abstain in its collective capacity from interfering with the discipline, had its original character, even when assembled as a Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders, been kept in view. From the time of its institution in 1753 till 1784, the general state of the ministry, and of the conduct of its members, was required to be laid before each Quarterly Meeting. In short, all the meetings of Ministers and Elders were till that time nothing more than so many

21. Joseph Sparkes, of Exeter.—"No doubt the notes are taking for the purpose of exposure, and I think they ought to be shown to the Clerk, that it might be ascertained whether they are correct; for, if they are not, Friends might be misrepresented."

22. John Mackellow.—"That is what I am afraid of. I have good ground to believe the young man is a member of London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting."

** 23. John Wilkinson—"Friends must be fully aware that the Meeting has no power to require the notes to be given up, nor have I, as their Clerk, any authority to restrain Friends from taking notes of the discussion. Friends should not be afraid of their proceedings being publicly known."

24. "I intreated the Friend to destroy the notes that have been taken."

** 25. George Saunders, of Whitby.—"Friends are not ashamed of their proceedings being known to all the world†."

** 26. William Tuke.—"I agree with the Friend who has just spoken, that we are not ashamed of our

standing Committees of the Meetings for Discipline. In the course of the next five years various changes were made, all tending systematically to remove them still further from that inspection and control to which they had been hitherto so properly subjected. From the year 1789 they were only required generally to state "*how* such select Meetings *have been conducted*;" and this badge of their former dependance on the Meetings for Discipline was removed in 1801, when the Yearly Meeting directed that their Reports to the Quarterly Meetings should in future be "*that* they have been *held*." Can it then be matter of surprise that many among them should be inclined to infringe the Christian privileges of their brethren?

† This is a manly declaration, and honourable to the person who made it. But I have strong reason to conclude that the general feeling among the most active disciplinarians in the Society is to keep their proceedings as close as possible, and to discourage, by every means in their power, all public discussion concerning them out of doors, especially when they are most irregular and intolerant.

proceedings being known: but I nevertheless object to notes of the discussion being taken; for some young persons especially may express themselves on such an occasion as this, in a manner that Friends as a body might not approve†."

27. Joseph Atkins, of Chipping Norton.—" I have been acquainted with the Appellant about thirty years, and have been led into sympathy with him. I have met him occasionally in the street, but never communicated my thoughts on the subject to him, or to any other Friend. If he was my own brother, I should cordially unite with the judgement of the Committee, wishing at the same time that his feet may be turned into that way which may afford him peace at last. His manner of interpreting the Scriptures I consider as slighting the authority of Christ. May we all look to our standing! We have none of us any thing to boast of.—My earnest desire is, that we may so live as to promote the cause of God, and of his dear Son our blessed Lord and Saviour."

† This Friend's motion for showing the young man the door who was taking notes, and who he mistakenly supposed was sitting in the Meeting "*only by sufferance*," not being seconded, he now argues the inexpediency of taking notes, because the younger part of the Assembly may express sentiments which as a body it may not approve. That may be the case, unless the Assembly be infallible, although what they express may be the very truth. Or they, in common with Ministers, Elders, or Representatives, being liable to err, may also reason inconclusively, or pronounce a rash and erroneous judgement. What, then, must it not be known out of doors? Error housed up, and taken under the patronage of secret conclaves, is always more dangerous than when it is subjected to free and public examination.

The preface to my Narrative, pp. v—viii. and p. 63 &c. of the work, show how some Disciplinarians have been disposed to censure those who may venture to object to their management of the Discipline when they thought it was assuming an illiberal or intolerant character. One of the persons who so strongly objected in the Quarterly Meeting to the proceedings against me, as unnecessary and unjust, was soon after *visited* by an Elder, who had defended those proceedings, on account of the strong manner in which he had expressed his sentiments. It was not, however, thought expedient, in this instance, to carry *dealing* any further.

* 28. Samuel Lloyd, of Birmingham.—" I also find a difficulty in speaking, on the ground of relationship and long-continued regard; but could not be easy without saying, that I think the judgement of the Quarterly Meeting ought to be confirmed, believing that there is no salvation for myself or any other man, but through the atonement and mediation of Jesus Christ our Lord."

29. " I approve the judgement of the Quarterly Meeting and of the Committee."

** 30. Joseph Gurney, of Norwich.—" I never felt more concurrence with Friends upon any occasion than on the present important question; viz., that the Appellant does not unite with the doctrines of the Society concerning Jesus Christ. In the discussion of this subject I apprehend there has been something like an attempt to scan the nature of the Divine Being, a subject far too mighty for me to enter upon, much less to comprehend. I feel great delicacy in speaking on these topics, from a sense of my own weakness; but although I am unable to form so clear and decided a judgement on these awful subjects as some of my Brethren of more experience than myself, I think it right to say that I acquiesce in the judgement of the Committee; for the Appellant has not only imbibed principles himself contrary to ours, but it has been clearly proved that he has been engaged in disseminating false doctrines†."

† I was indebted to this respectable Friend for a kind visit soon after the decision of the Yearly Meeting on my case. I did not then at all know how he had expressed himself on it. But I supposed there was no very wide difference in our opinions concerning " the doctrines of the Society with respect to Jesus Christ," having heard it asserted in very respectable company *as no secret*, that he professed subsequent to my disownment wholly to approve Penn's " Sandy Foundation Shaken." My " endeavours to convince others," that these principles are those of the New Testament, seems, however, the principal reason why he approved the judgement of the Committee. This is very accordant to the recorded opinion of another Friend. See preface to Narrative, p. iv. In p. 13 of that work I have mentioned that the " Sandy Foundation Shaken" was very impressively recommended by a Minister of eminence to the

31. "I approve the judgement of the Committee, from a sense of its importance to our Religion. For the Meeting not to approve it, would be to upset the corner-stone elect and precious, and to strike at the very foundation of all true religion amongst us."

** 32. William Candler, of Ipswich.—"I wish very much that Friends would confine themselves simply to the point in question, whether they do or do not ap-

general attention of Friends at a Yearly Meeting many years ago, at which I was present. When my case was before the Quarterly Meeting's Committee, Luke Howard asked if I had any objection to say who this Minister was. I replied, "He is still living, and I had rather not mention his name, lest I should thereby be the means of inciting any weak-minded Disciplinarians to disturb his latter days on such an account." This Luke Howard granted to be a sufficient reason for not naming this friend. He is now beyond their reach. According to my Minutes made at the time, the Discussion alluded to took place 5th Month 24th, 1791, (only a few months after the institution of "the London Unitarian Book Society.") On reading the Epistle for that year *a second time*, "an objection was made by one Friend" (I believe, the late John Bevans) to a passage, not as unsound or unscriptural, but as being "*likely to be laid hold of by Unitarians.*" It declared the Lord Almighty, or God the Father according to the sense of many plain texts of Scripture, to be "the *alone* object of worship." Thomas Pole proposed to leave out the word "*alone.*" Several other Friends said they thought *it might stand very safely*, as brought in by *the large Committee* (which consisted of more than a hundred persons specially appointed, besides being open to Ministers, Elders, and to all the Members of the Meeting for Sufferings); that it would be better for Friends to avoid such nice and useless distinctions on the subject as many other professors of Christianity had gone into.

After this, one or two Friends expressing themselves in language somewhat approaching the common doctrine of the Trinity, the late *William Jepson*, of Lancaster, an approved Minister, who had been Clerk in 1788, rose and said "I am sorry to see Friends go into such nice and unprofitable distinctions." He then quoted some of the strongest texts, especially from the Old Testament, declaring in the most direct and positive terms the complete and essential Unity of God: after which he expressed an earnest wish that Friends would more generally read, and seriously consider, William Penn's work entitled "The Sandy Foundation Shaken," and recommended it as well worthy their attention. To this no reply was made, but it was previously agreed to omit the whole paragraph.

prove the judgement of the Committee. For my part, I do approve it†."

** 33. John Wilkinson.—" I hope Friends will not confine themselves too much. It has been a great satisfaction to me that so many persons have already expressed their sentiments upon the subject, and I wish Friends who are duly impressed with its importance would assign the reasons on which their judgement is founded.

34. Atkinson Francis Gibson, of Saffron Walden, at some length expressed his assent to the judgement of the Committee.

** 35. Thomas Clarke, of Bridgewater.—" I unite in the judgement of the Committee. I have been an old acquaintance of the Appellant's, and have no doubt but he may yet be enabled to see the error of his way. I have known more than one *beclouded* by sitting down in their own strength‡. The subject under discussion is a very important one to each of us, and should make a deep and reverent impression on our minds; it being no less than attempting to take a view of the Divine Being. Moses could not behold him, his eyes were dim at the prospect. God reveals himself to us, but language is inadequate to define him. I trust these observations are not foreign to the subject. The Lord from Heaven

* A work of this Friend's is mentioned in my Appeal, pp. 83, 84. The groundless apprehensions of the preceding speaker seem to have led him to proscribe, so far as his recommendation would go, *all reasoning upon the subject.* He was doubtless aware that if much of this was entered into, no small variety of sentiment would be apparent among my judges. The Clerk, however, very properly expressed a wish that Friends would " not confine themselves too much," hinting the propriety of assigning their reasons for the judgement they might pronounce.

‡ At the dedication of the Temple, after saying " upon his knees before all the congregation, O Lord God of Israel, there is no God like thee in the heaven, nor in the earth, who keepest covenant and shewest mercy unto thy servants, that walk before thee with all their hearts," Solomon asks, " But will God *in very deed* dwell with men on the earth?" The answer he gives to

condescended to dwell with men. Yet is he not known, but only to those to whom he is inwardly revealed. I have felt much for the Appellant, and also for Friends. I have read many Unitarian Tracts, and have observed that writers of that persuasion never appear to approve the doctrine of inspiration, or of divine influence on the mind." He concluded by saying, "If thou blaspheme the Son of man, it shall be forgiven thee; but if thou blaspheme the Holy Spirit, it is written, Thou shalt neither be forgiven in this world nor in that which is to come†."

36. Joseph Geldart, Jun. of Norwich.—"I rise to speak on this subject with considerable difficulty, from the discouragement held out by a Friend in the corner opposite, who says, 'If any man speak, let him speak *as the Oracle of God.*'

"To have given the most considerate attention to the matter before us, and to have endeavoured to avail myself of the best direction which I could obtain, is the most to which I can pretend. Any thing beyond this supposes a degree of infallibility, *the very idea of which would for ever seal my lips with perpetual silence.*

"But I am the more encouraged to deliver my opi-

this question is worthy of being held in everlasting remembrance, and should teach us the deepest humility. "*Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee, how much less this house which I have built!*"

† How this allusion to a text, for it is not correctly quoted, can have been thought applicable to my case, I cannot imagine. But I think my old school-fellow could not have intended to hold me up as a blasphemer, and one, too, that was never to be forgiven! Well acquainted as this Friend professed to be with Unitarian Tracts, he does not seem to have been so much impressed with any errors they contained concerning the doctrine of the Unity of God, the real point at issue, as with those which he imputes to the writers of them, *as being weak in the faith* on another and a totally different subject. And as to attempting to define the nature or essence of the Divine Being, it is not those who are content with the simple but sublime doctrine of revelation, that God is ONE, but those who without any authority from the Scriptures assert that in this One God there are "three persons—co-eternal and co-equal," who are justly chargeable with such presumption.

nion, because I believe that I agree entirely, one person only excepted (John Bateman) with all those who have as yet delivered their sentiments †. That individual goes the whole length of saying, that he entirely approves of all the proceedings of the Monthly Meeting of Ratcliff. Now I wholly differ from him in this respect. I do *not* approve of *any* of their proceedings. I think, from the Minutes read yesterday, there was a want of patience, of brotherly kindness, and of judgement in what they did. Still I think it probable the result would have been the same, though no one can tell that, had different measures been at first pursued.

"I am induced to agree to confirm the Report of the Committee, because, although Thomas Foster may not be responsible for all the books published by the London Unitarian Book Society; yet I hold him answerable for the public address to their pamphlet [the book of rules], and for the sentiments contained in the notes to the new translation called "The Improved Version." For whoever has read the history of this translation in the Life of Theophilus Lindsey must know that it has been for many years a principal object with the London Unitarian [book] Society, and particularly supported by them ‡.

† From this observation it should seem that J. G.'s encouragement to speak his mind, was in exact proportion to its being unnecessary; and that he would probably have been entirely silent, had he not derived encouragement from the persuasion that he agreed in sentiment with the majority of those who had spoken.

How many of the persons present who disapproved all the proceedings which were founded on those of Ratcliff Meeting, withheld their sentiments on similar grounds, it is not easy to say.

‡ It is singular that the only person who took part in this discussion, and disclaimed the imputation of speaking with oracular authority, should have admitted on the one hand that he did not approve *any* of the proceedings of the Monthly Meeting, and on the other agree to a Report which confirms those proceedings without making any exception. This is to defend the conclusion when supported by a majority of votes, for most of the speeches were nothing more, and to reject the whole of the premises on the recti-

"A *slight* inspection which I once gave it will I think justify me in saying, that it is a work which has a tendency to lower the character of Jesus Christ †, that it rejects the doctrine of the Atonement ‡, wipes out by a

tude of which that conclusion could only be well founded. On what principle J. G. held me answerable for a "public address" to which I had never agreed, or more responsible for the notes to a work on none of which was I ever consulted, than for the contents of other books published by the same Society, he did not explain, nor can I understand. As to the "public Address," a very "slight inspection" of the work he refers to might have shown him that some parts of it were strongly objected to from the first, by strict Unitarians, "as narrowing too much the ground of the Society;" and that the introduction of the word *idolatrous* into the paragraph quoted by the Respondents, p. 10, and commented on by them, p. 11 &c. "gave very great offence to many of the Friends of the infant Institution," and prevented "some Gentlemen of Cambridge and elsewhere, whose names would have been an ornament to the Society," from "joining it," or induced them to withdraw from it. But that others "who still continued in the Society" disapproved "the expression—as having a tendency to fix an opprobrium upon their fellow-Christians." Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey, pp. 297—299.

† A *slight* inspection of this work may produce such a notion, which better acquaintance with it could hardly fail to correct. For it contains as ample a record as the received Version, of the divine sayings, excellent precepts, benevolent and mighty works of Jesus Christ, the Son of the ever-living God, who obeyed his will always and in all things, and was *therefore* highly exalted at the right hand of the throne of the Most High. Is this to lower the character of the meek and humble Jesus, who sought not his own glory, but the glory of the Father who sent him? If it be, such is the tendency of the Improved Version.

‡ Not more than William Penn has, in the "Sandy Foundation Shaken," and in other parts of his writings. For he represented the doctrine as inconsistent with the sense of Scripture, and as unavoidably and absurdly supposing "that the finite and impotent Creature is more capable of extending mercy and forgiveness than the Infinite and Omnipotent *Creator*."

The doctrine of the Atonement, under every form of it that I am acquainted with, is highly injurious to the moral character of God; for it represents him as a *reformed Being*, or rendered placable by another, although his goodness has ever been unchangeably the same, and endureth for ever. The genuine features of this unchristian doctrine are boldly but correctly traced in the following Hymn by the celebrated Dr. Isaac Watts, which in the early part

note the solemn command of our Saviour, "Swear not at all†," and endeavours to persuade Christians that they have not an unwearied adversary whom it is constantly necessary to guard against, but whose very existence is doubted or denied‡.

of his life he approved, but certainly not after he had rejected the common doctrine of the Trinity.

"Rich were the drops of Jesus' blood,
That calm'd his [God's] frowning face,
That sprinkled o'er the burning throne,
And turn'd his wrath to grace.
Is there no shelter from the eye
Of a revenging God?
Jesus, to thy dear wounds I fly,
Bedew me with thy blood.
Conceived in sin (O wretched state!)
Before we draw our breath,
The first young pulse begins to beat
Iniquity and death."

Such are the devotional terms in which I have reason to suppose many congregations of professing Christians publicly express their homage to the Prophet of Nazareth, *as the reformer of his God and Father!*

† The note referred to is on Matt. v. 34. It does not however *wipe out* the command there recorded, but recognises and explains it, as it is understood by the great bulk of Christians, although not as J. G. or I may approve. The note is as follows. "That ye swear not at all." N. See Wakefield. It is a prohibition not of judicial oaths, but of swearing upon trifling occasions, and by trifling objects." As J. G. had no reason to suppose I approved either, he should have inferred that I was not responsible for *all* the sentiments contained in these notes.

‡ Had Joseph Geldart chosen to give us his ideas of this "unwearied adversary," as to his supposed powers and omnipresence, and the texts on which his opinions are founded, we might have judged how far they were Scriptural. But as he has not, although none of my accusers ever called upon me to profess my belief in the deity of Satan which J. G. seems to have made without prompting, I will close this note by recommending the passages he has referred to on this subject, to his serious attention. They are, I suppose, these: the notes on Matt. iv. 1. Luke xiii. 16. xxii. 3. John viii. 44. xiii. 2, 27. Acts v. 3. x. 38. 2 Cor. xi. 14. xii. 7. 1 Thess. ii. 18. 1 Tim. v. 16. 1 John iii. 8. v. 19. Jude v. 6. Rev. ii. 24. iii. 9. iv. 2. and xx. 3.

These opinions are, I conceive, so totally at variance with those of our Society, that I must confess, though disapproving the original proceedings, the subsequent disownment appears to have been unavoidable; and on the ground of this difference of sentiment between the Appellant and the Society, I consent to confirm the Report†."

**35. Charles Parker, of Yelland, in Lancashire.—"I think it is so clearly the judgement of the Meeting, that the Report of the Committee should be confirmed, that there appears to be little occasion to make any addition to what has been delivered. I would, however, censure the impropriety of any Friend taking notes of the discussion."

36. "I am apprehensive what the Friend who has just sat down has said will discourage Friends who might wish to speak, from expressing their sentiments. I approve the Committee's Report, and concur with him as to the impropriety of taking notes."

37. Richard Cadbury, of Birmingham.—"I also approve the judgement of the Committee, and think the Clerk should require the notes to be given up."

**38. John Wilkinson.—"I wish this Friend to reflect on the proposal he has made. The Meeting must surely be sensible that I have no power vested in me as its Clerk, to require any notes that may have been taken, to be delivered up‡."

† I am much obliged to this Friend for sending me a written report of his speech, lest I should be misinformed respecting it. The above is a copy of the paper sent me. And if he should ever see the remarks I have annexed to it, I am persuaded the same candid disposition which induced him, though a stranger to me, to take care I should know what he did say, will lead him readily to excuse the freedom of those remarks.

‡ It may be proper to say here, that I had not requested any person to take notes, but I think myself indebted to those persons who furnished me with them. It was more than I expected. Not that I doubted there being many persons in the Meeting, who would admit it to be proper that I should know what was said concerning me

** 39. George Saunders.—" I fully unite in the judgement of the Committee, thinking the Appellant has long entertained principles different from those of Friends, which I may compare to a disease ; and in order to save the whole body, the limb affected should be removed. This I believe to be the case with Thomas Foster, in respect to the Society †."

** 40. Stephen Grellet, of New-York, North America, expressed his concurrence with the Committee's decision.

** 41. James Saunders, of Bristol, and **42 Joseph Sams, of Darlington, united in the same opinion.

43 * Thomas Catchpool, of Colchester, exhorted the young men to come forward to express their approval or disapprobation of the Committee's judgement ‡; *if there be such a thing as the latter in the Meeting.*

and my case when I was not allowed to be present. Others it seems are so impressed with the *expediency of secrecy*, as to consider the report given me as "*a high breach of privilege* on the part of any member of the Society !"

† Whether this Friend thinks the Church of which he is both a member and a minister is always infallibly right, or, like certain Protestant Churches, claims only to be *never in the wrong*, I cannot say. But without defining either the principles he speaks of, or in what degree he supposed I differed from them, and on what grounds, he describes my case as "*a disease*," and one of so dangerous a nature that "the limb affected" required to be cut off "to save the whole body" from being contaminated.

The use of the term *heretic*, as a mark of reproach to those who receive the doctrine of Scripture only, and refuse to receive any other, is, I hope, well nigh worn out. The same thing is in this instance called by a more frightful name; but that only shows the apprehensions that are entertained of its prevalence. Nor will such measures do any thing to impede its progress; they are more likely to accelerate its course.

Even as a matter of policy, Church rulers had better in these times, take the advice of our common Lord and Master : "Let both," [the tares and the wheat] says he, "grow together until the harvest, lest while ye gather up the tares ye root up also the wheat."

‡ This Elder seems to have formed a much more correct notion than William Tuke, of the privileges of those whom the latter held not to be members of the Meeting, but sitting there only *by sufferance*; for he exhorted them to come forward and exercise their rights.

**44 Dykes Alexander, of Ipswich.—"I have no doubt but there are still many Friends who wish to express their opinions on the subject. For one, I should not like it to pass with a silent assent."

*45. James Hack, of Chichester.—"I approve the Committee's decision."

** 46. Isaac Wright, of Haverill, Essex.—"I approve the judgement of the Committee; and when I looked at them, and saw what striplings had been employed, I recollected how David went down to the brook, and chose smooth stones, there was to be no roughness. [Here I heard, says my informant, a voice, which I think was Wm. Tuke's, exclaim 'Shocking, shocking†!'] Isaac Wright continued. I observed that the Appellant while defending himself was turning over Friends' books, &c.; and

He might possibly recollect that the first Christian Council is described in the New Testament as consisting of "the Apostles and Elders, and *Brethren*." See Acts xv. 23. This Friend might not however know, that much disapprobation of the proceedings which the judgement of the Committee went to confirm, was expressed when the case was before the Quarterly Meeting. On one side of the subject there was *then* some serious argument; and I presume, as it remained unanswered, he had no reason to suppose these persons, although silence was now imposed upon them, had changed their sentiments.

His notion, that entire unanimity on such a subject prevailed in an assembly consisting of about twelve hundred persons, is utterly improbable and unfounded. I happen to know there were many persons present who disapproved these proceedings, both of those who were precluded from speaking, and of those who were not, and waved the right from diffidence, or from a conviction that it would be *useless*, or an apprehension that it might subject them to *dealing* and disownment, in the present temper of the rulers of the Society.

† This Friend's description of the Committee, as "striplings," whose appearance reminded him of the youthful David, or an apprehension that he was about to make a rough figurative application of the smooth stones of the brook, to the Appellant, for the Giant's sword was not yet mentioned, seems to have shocked some of the Elders, who appear to have placed so strong a reliance on the Committee's judgement as Theologians, as to wave calling for any explanation of the grounds on which it rested, although these were required by an express rule of the Yearly Meeting to be stated "in the presence of the Appellant and Respondents!"

the title of an ancient Friend's book was brought to my mind†; viz. "Goliah killed with his own sword." And this will be the case with the Appellant.

* 47. Richard Ball.—"I feel extremely uneasy at what has been said by the Friend who spoke last. By the use of metaphorical language, which I much wish Friends would avoid in speaking on such subjects as these, he has likened the Appellant to a man who defied the armies of the Living God, which I think indicates a want of that Christian spirit which we ought to show one to another. For my part, I can most cheerfully hold out the right hand of fellowship towards the Appellant, and I hoped there would have been none in this Meeting, that could not unite with me in so doing. I have known him long, and believe him to be as sincere a man as myself or any other Friend in this Meeting; and though he appears to have erred, and to have mistaken his path, he might live to see his error, as I sincerely hope he may; in which case I trust Friends would cordially receive

† Without a word or two of explanation, some of my readers may be at a loss to understand the import of this phrase. They should know, then, that it is no less than a kind of claim to *actual inspiration*, intimating that the subjects so spoken of were not presented to the mind by the ordinary process of cogitation, or the faculty of memory, but supernaturally *brought* into view. It is one of those phrases used almost exclusively by Ministers among Friends, and most frequently by such as are both weak and unskilful in the exercise of their gifts. They are, however, all advised to be cautious of laying *too great a stress* on their testimony, by *too positively asserting a divine* MOTION—the baptizing power of truth *being the true evidence.* Book of Extracts, p. 149.

On this principle, it may be asked, How is Scriptural evidence to be estimated? That which is asserted in the 1st edition of this work to be "*the best evidence,*" and in the 2d edition to be "*the true evidence,*" may often, I suppose, be nothing more than a strong persuasion of the mind, that a certain position or tenet is true or false; although that persuasion is pompously described as "the baptizing power of truth." Whatever this may be, it is certainly no appeal to *Scriptural authority.* See Locke's Essay on Enthusiasm, the last edition of which seems to have been properly enough dedicated to the Society of Friends.

him. I unite with the judgement of the Committee, although I cannot approve the proceedings of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting."

* 48. Joseph Storrs, of Chesterfield.—"I approve the sentiments which have been expressed by the Friend who has just sat down."

** 49. John Wilkinson.—"I think myself bound in duty to call Isaac Wright to order. The sentiments he has uttered, I consider, in concurrence with the Friends who have just spoken, as entirely inconsistent with the principles of a Friend. His speech, I must say, indicates great animosity."

** 50. Isaac Wright here apologized to the Meeting, but in what terms I have not been distinctly informed.

51. Thomas Catchpool, jun. of Colchester.—"I assent to the judgement of the Committee, and hope other young Friends will step forward to declare their opinions."

* 52. William Whitehead, of Warwick; and

53. —merely said they approved the decision of the Committee.

** 54. Samuel Alexander, of Needham, spoke for some time, but only to the same purpose.

55. William Westlake, of Southampton.—"I do not think I shall be quite easy without stating to the Meeting that I have great cause to rejoice at the triumph of truth."

*56. Isaac Braithwaite, of Kendal.—"It is painful to me to express an approval of the Committee's judgement, on account of being related to the Appellant: at the same time I think Ratcliff Meeting was too precipitate in its decision."

* 57. Edward Pease, of Darlington;

** 58. John Shipley, of Shaftsbury; and

** 59. William Gundry, of Calne,—all expressed their approval of the Committee's decision.

60. John Shewell, of Ipswich, spoke much; but in

so low a voice that little more was heard than that he approved the judgement of the Committee.

61. Henry Alexander, of Ipswich.—"I think it is the sense of the Meeting that a minute confirming the Report of the Committee should be made and read."

** 62. John Wilkinson.—"*I believe that proposal is quite premature.*" †

63.

64. Richard Lambert Weston, of Chatham;

65. wished the decision of the Committee to be confirmed.

66. "I concur therewith, except with regard to the proceedings of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting."

67. Samuel Tregellis, of Falmouth.—"I cannot but express my unity with the Report of the Committee, but with a similar exception as to the conduct of Ratcliff Meeting."

* 68. William Dilworth Crewdson, of Kendal.—"I incline to think *rather too much* censure has been expressed *by some Friends* on the conduct of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting, for which some apology should be made, as there is no rule of the Society immediately applicable to the case by which they could regulate their proceedings. I have felt much for the unpleasant situation in which they had been placed; and I cannot but approve the judgement of the Committee, though I am somewhat connected with the Appellant's family by the ties of relationship."

† If the proposal here alluded to was "*quite premature*," at this stage of the discussion, it is very difficult to make out that any additional grounds were afterwards assigned for the recorded judgement of so numerous an Assembly, either "*with*" or without "*much unanimity*." About a twentieth part of the persons present appear to have spoken, and of these very few condescended to assign the reasons whereon their judgement was founded. So that the decision of the Meeting rested on very little more than the mere votes of *so small a proportion of its members.*

69.

70. , concurred in the opinion of W. D. Crewdson†.

Such were, I understand by the concurring evidence of much more than "*two or three witnesses*," and such too as are worthy of credit, the prominent features of this discussion, and especially of those parts of it which had the most relation to the matters at issue. It occupied about two hours, including the time afterwards taken up in settling a minute on the subject. A short space indeed, when the number of speakers is considered.

During this "deliberate consideration" of the case, the Respondents and myself were in waiting at the Clerk's Office, where we had some friendly conversation. About one o'clock we received notice that the Meeting had come to a conclusion, which we were at

† Thomas Clarkson tells us, in his Portraiture of Quakerism, vol. i. p. 240, that whatever question "comes before the Yearly Meeting at large, *it is decided*, not by the influence of numbers, but by *the weight of religious character*." This is truly a most uncertain criterion, unless its members eminently possess the gift of spiritual discernment. He is, however, perfectly correct in saying p. 241, "But in whatever way the question before them is settled," whether it be according to evidence, or plainly against it, "*no division is ever called for*. No counting of numbers *is allowed*. No protest *is suffered to be entered*." The speeches then are *the only evidence*, what is, or is not, "the sense of the Meeting," or of the persons assembled. And in proportion as the speeches are destitute of reasoning, they approach the character of so many Ayes or Noes upon the question before the Meeting. Many of the speeches on the present occasion can only be considered as so many votes; and although the number of speakers was unusually great, they can hardly have exceeded a twentieth part of the number of members present. The opinions therefore of the rest of the Meeting were not in any manner ascertained. And of these speakers a considerable majority were Ministers, or Elders, members of that Meeting which sanctioned the publication of a work while my Appeal was pending, calculated to excite powerful prejudices against me amongst my judges, and on which I was peremptorily refused a hearing. See my Appeal, p. 45—55. So that I was at last subjected to the real judgement of my accusers, under the semblance of enjoying the important privilege of Appeal.

liberty to hear read. We were soon after introduced to seats near the centre of the Meeting. After a short pause,

The following minute was read by the Clerk.

"*This Meeting having* deliberately considered *the case of Thomas Foster on his Appeal against the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex*, also the Report *of the Committee of this Meeting, appointed to hear* and judge *of the said Appeal, is*, with much unanimity, *of the judgement that the Report of the said Committee should be confirmed; and it is hereby confirmed accordingly**."

* From the commencement of these proceedings to their termination, I have been impressed with a conviction, that the *ostensible*, were not *real* grounds upon which they were taken up, or carried on. The evidence of this has been continually increasing. And so far is the Yearly Meeting since my expulsion was effected, from having really adopted any Trinitarian hypothesis even of the most qualified complexion, that in its Epistle for 1815, it has openly asserted as Christian truths, all those great tenets by which Unitarianism is distinguished, and which, by the records of the several Meetings which have decided on my case, are imputed to me as erroneous. Soon after I was officially informed of this open recurrence of the Church to the simplicity of its primitive principles, I addressed a respectful Letter to the Monthly Meeting by which I was excommunicated. For a copy of this Letter see the Monthly Repository, for March 1816, vol. x. p. 153. Before it was published, I addressed the following Letter on the same subject to the Quarterly Meeting which confirmed that decision. Soon after the close of the previous Meeting for worship, which I attended, I *publicly* presented it at the Table, while the Meeting for Discipline was assembling, audibly saying: "Before I withdraw I believe it right for me to deliver this Letter to the Quarterly Meeting, and I trust it will be found respectful and proper to be read." Two Friends to whom it was referred were, as appears by their Report to the Meeting, of a different opinion, and it was the next day returned to me by the Clerk, as not being "thought proper to be read in the Meeting." I therefore insert it here, as being closely connected with the subject of this work.

"*To the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, to be held 3d Month,* 26th, 1816.

"Dear Friends,

"Having incurred your censure for 'calling in question' certain

"A copy of this Minute to be given the Appellant, and to the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex."

doctrines 'professed by the Yearly Meeting, in its Epistle for 1810,' and being now able with much sincerity to avow my cordial approbation of those which its Epistle for the present year contains *upon the same subjects,* I hope expressing the same to you will not be deemed an improper exercise of my Christian liberty, or give you just cause for dissatisfaction. How this Epistle can be reconciled to the former, I know not, but *this* I beg leave to refer to you, as being well worthy your consideration.

"On hearing the latter Epistle read in the last autumn Quarterly Meeting, I was forcibly struck with the soundness, clearness, and Scriptural simplicity of its language, compared with that of the former, upon every point of doctrine on which erroneous opinions are imputed to me by your records, and that without feeling conscious of any change in my sentiments.

"My attention was again drawn to this Epistle, as the latest and most authentic exposition of the doctrines of the Society, by the delivery of a copy to me, by one of your members appointed to distribute those Epistles. Since this time I have carefully examined its contents, and in the respective situation in which we stand to each other, as *fellow-christians,* and children of the same benevolent Parent of the Universe, even 'THE GOD *and* FATHER *of our Lord Jesus Christ,*' I feel that I owe it to you, before I close this letter, briefly to call your serious attention to those parts of the last Yearly Meeting Epistle to which I have alluded. In doing this I shall annex a few words to mark more plainly how I understand the Epistle, always distinguishing them from the text. It begins thus:

"'In offering you this salutation of our love, we believe it right to acknowledge our thankfulness to THE AUTHOR OF ALL GOOD, that we have been permitted to meet together. We have had again to rejoice in a sense of the goodness of Him ['the Author of all good'] who, by his presence, owned us in times past—we have felt the consoling assurance that the Divine Power [of Him who is omnipresent, and whose mercies are over all his works] is both ancient and new.' That is, I presume more properly, *is unchangeable.* 'It is from this holy source ['of all good'] that every enjoyment,' says this Epistle, 'both spiritual and temporal flows; it is to THE LORD ALMIGHTY that *we are indebted* for *the blessing of existence,* for *the means of redemption,* and for *that lively hope of immortality* which comes *by Jesus Christ.*'

"This is *much more* than merely '*calling in question* the omnipotence of Jesus Christ.' It is expressly to attribute *omnipotent power* and *boundless goodness to another being,* even to 'THE LORD

I heard it with perfect composure of mind, ignorant as I then was of the character and complexion of the preceding discussion. Yet, I could not but be im-

ALMIGHTY,' the ever-living and unchangeable God; and to describe Jesus Christ as the medium by whom the 'lively hope' of the greatest of these blessings was made known to mankind through the gospel.

"If we are '*indebted* TO THE LORD ALMIGHTY'—the giver of every good, and of every perfect gift, 'for the blessing of existence,' as this Epistle asserts, surely He 'endowed us by nature' with those 'talents—however great,' by which we are distinguished from every other order of beings in this sublunary world. 'To his service, then, dear Friends,' adds the Epistle, 'in obedience to the manifestation of his power [which is fresh every morning, for the earth is full of his goodness] *let us offer our talents*; to the glory of his great and excellent name, *let us devote our strength* and *the residue of our days*.'

"As to '*the propriety*,' and *the duty* of '*secret supplication*,' and *to whom* it should *be addressed*, this Epistle is *equally explicit* and *Scriptural*. After recommending the youth 'to allot a portion of each day to read and *meditate* upon the sacred volume [the Scriptures] *in private*,' this exhortation is added: 'In these seasons of retirement, seek for ability to enter into a close examination of your own hearts; and as you may be enabled, *secretly* pray to THE ALMIGHTY for preservation from the temptations with which you are encompassed.' Again: 'Let their example,' that of some Friends lately deceased, 'encourage you *to offer all your natural powers*, and *every intellectual attainment*, to the service of the *same Lord*, and patiently to persevere in a course of unremitting obedience to *the Divine Will*.' If we pray then 'with the spirit, and with *the understanding also*,' whether openly or in secret, surely it should be offered *only* to *the same Lord*—'THE ALMIGHTY,' as this Epistle enjoins, and not even to *Jesus* 'whom he [God] *hath made—both Lord and Christ*.' Acts ii. 36.

"The Epistle concludes thus: 'Let us ever remember, that if we obey the Divine commandments, we shall do all *to the glory of God*; we shall *always acknowledge*, that it is of his mercy, if we ever become partakers of the unspeakable privilege of the true disciples of Him ['the Lord Jesus'] who 'died for all, that they that live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him *who died for them*, and *rose again*.' 2 Cor. v. 15.

"From this passage I understand, that in the judgement of the compilers of this Epistle, we cannot become '*true disciples*' of '*the Lord Jesus*,' whom God raised from the dead, without being 'always' ready to 'acknowledge,' that we owe '*the unspeakable privilege*' to 'THE MERCY OF GOD,' *the Original Source* and *proper*

pressed from the language of the Minute, that it was much more founded on the deference supposed to be due to the mere authority of the Committee's Report, the grounds of which the Meeting, in direct breach of its own rule, refused to hear explained, than on any deliberate consideration of my Appeal, (which was only once read,) of my Address, the Respondents' Reply, and my Rejoinder, *as it ought to have been.* I nevertheless felt no inclination to address the Meeting again, and therefore requested my Father Compton to apply to the Meeting in my name, when I was withdrawn, for a copy of the Committee's Report, without which I should not officially know what the Meeting's decision was.

A few minutes after, I withdrew in silence, thankful that I had openly and faithfully throughout this contest borne my testimony, however feebly or ineffectually, against an intolerant and inquisitorial exercise of Church authority, by the agents of a small junta of Disciplinarians, whose influence pervades, and over-rules, all the constituted authorities of the Society. Nor am I less thankful that I also avowed with equal plainness, my unshaken belief *in the Unity, Supremacy, Mercy and Purity of the one only true God and Father, of the Universe.*

Author of all the blessings conferred on mankind by Jesus Christ, and by the gospel which he preached. I congratulate you and the Society on so speedy a *return* to the common language of our ancestors, and to that 'form of sound words' which is to be found in the Scriptures of truth; and remain your sincere well-wishing Friend,

"THOMAS FOSTER.

"Bromley, March 25, 1816."

APPENDIX.

ON THE MORAL SENSE, OR CONSCIENCE.

"The Conscience is that internal principle, which, without reasoning, without direct reflection on the *consequences* of actions, or even on their *obligation*, at once approves certain dispositions or actions as *right*, or as what we ought to cultivate and practise; and at once disapproves of certain dispositions and actions, as *wrong*, or as what we ought to check and avoid. The human mind is so formed, that the conscience will spring up in it: nevertheless it is equally true and important, that its dictates are not universally the same, and that it is an improvable principle;—that to give it early correctness and vigour, requires great care on the part of those who are concerned in the early periods of education;—and that to give it due *sensibility*, *accuracy*, and *influence*, requires the use of suitable means in every period of life.

"The pleasures and pains of the conscience (like all other mental feelings) are produced by the ever active principle of association, which, under the occasional control and direction of the understanding, connects, combines, and blends together a vast variety of pleasures and pains; and thus forms a set of feelings, which most powerfully influence the conduct, and contribute most essentially to the happiness or wretchedness of the individual. These feelings are derived from all the other pleasures and pains of our nature, so far as they are consistent with one another, with the frame of our nature, and with the course of the world (see Hartley, vol. i. prop. 99). They are continually presenting themselves, urging us to shun some branches of conduct, and to pursue others; rewarding us for our obedience, with some of our purest and best satisfactions; and punishing us for our neglect and disobedience, with emotions always painful, and sometimes so agonizing, that life loses all its relish; and all the pleasures which have been purchased by slighting its warnings, lose their power to give more than temporary relief.

"As soon as the moral principle begins to appear, a great variety of impressions, some designedly communicated, and others produced as it were accidentally, begin to connect with the terms *good* and *right*, (and others similar to them,) pleasing feelings, derived directly from sensation, or from the approbation of friends, &c.; and with the words *wicked*, *wrong*, &c., painful feelings, in like manner derived directly from sensation, or from the feelings of shame. If children are so happy as to have parents whose ideas respecting duty are generally correct, these feelings will be properly directed; and they will then be increased, strengthened, and rendered more and more lively, by the continual addition of many others, derived from various sources. If not, there will be a pro-

portionable deficiency, or erroneousness, in the dictates of the conscience, which will be to be corrected, if corrected at all, by experience, or by increased knowledge, afforded by the Scriptures, or some other rule of life, respecting duty, and the consequences of performing or neglecting it.

"But supposing the generally favourable, and not uncommon case, where an individual has had the advantage of an early correct direction of his moral feelings,—here all the pleasures arising from the exercise of the filial affections, all the pains arising, as natural consequences, or as direct punishment, from disobedience, or the neglect of parental injunctions, contribute their share to strengthen and enliven these feelings. As soon as some knowledge of God and of a future life have been obtained, the affections which are formed towards God, the hope of future happiness, and the dread of future misery, begin to add to the vigour and extent of the feelings of conscience; and they continually, and through life, contribute those impressions which powerfully tend to give activity and energy to its pleasures and pains, while at the same time they correct and confirm its dictates. Separate from this source, though not independent of it, the beneficial tendency of right conduct and dispositions, and the injurious tendency of the contrary, with respect to the happiness both of the individual and of others, in the way of interest, or reputation, or social comfort, (whether the result of experience, or observation, or pointed out in a less impressive yet often effectual way, by the instructions of parents and friends,) add to the strength and liveliness of the emotions of approbation and disapprobation.

"Though the feelings of the moral sense have a general agreement in their force and direction, in different individuals, who have enjoyed the usual advantages for the cultivation of the conscience, yet even in them the component parts must vary considerably, both in kind and in degree. Without attempting, therefore, to enter into a minute account of the formation of those very complicated feelings, composed, as they are, of a vast variety of other feelings, themselves greatly complicated, it may be sufficient to observe, that every pleasing or painful impression, received in connexion with right or wrong conduct, contributes towards the formation or growth of the pleasures and pains of conscience.

"Every instance in which approbation, reward, or any other good consequences, are actually experienced, or are observed to be experienced by others, in consequence of right conduct,—every instance in which the mind is led to perceive the beneficial tendency of right conduct, its suitableness to the course of providence, and to the frame of man,—every instance in which our own right conduct does good, or gives pleasing satisfaction to others, especially to those whom we love,—every instance in which the heart is impressed with the conviction, that HE who is greater than the heart, knows and approves of sincere and dutiful obedience to his commands,—every thoughtful reflection on the infinitely blissful conse-

quences of a course of steady obedience to duty,—and every instance in which the present supports of obedience are experienced, or perceived in others,—contributes its share towards the formation and strength of those feelings of love and approbation of what is considered as our duty, which make the contemplation of right actions and dispositions a source of delightful emotion; and which reward the performance of the one, and exercise the culture of the other, by that approving testimony, which has often been an abundant recompense for the greatest pains and privations to which duty may direct.

"And, on the other hand, every instance in which displeasure, shame, punishment, or any other ill consequences, are actually experienced, or are observed to be experienced by others, in consequence of wrong conduct, or in which the mind is led to perceive its injurious tendency, its unsuitableness to the course of providence, and to the frame of man,—every instance in which our wrong conduct does injury, or gives painful regret to others, especially to those whom we love,—every instance in which the thoughtful conviction is excited, that HE who knoweth every secret of the heart, is displeased with disobedience, and that the consequence of every act of disobedience, of every indulgence of wrong disposition, of every neglect of duty, and the affections enjoined by it, will, in his all-righteous ordinations, be followed by its proportionate diminution of happiness, or increase of misery, probably in this life, but certainly in another,—every instance in which the present pains of conscience are experienced, or observed in others, in consequence of the neglect of its dictates, or disobedience to them—contributes its share towards the formation and strength of those lively feelings of disapprobation or even abhorrence, with which we contemplate what, in others, is considered as inconsistent with or contrary to duty, and of remorse, in consequence of wrong actions and dispositions in ourselves; which punish the performance of the one, and the indulgence of the other, with pains that often exceed in vividness, all others to which the human being is exposed in this world; which, though sometimes overcome by the bustle and pleasures of the world, seldom fail to revive in the period of worldly distress, or in the time of sickness and the apprehension of death; and which will, in all probability, constitute a great part of the awful punishments of futurity.

"This view of the formation of the pleasures and pains of the conscience, will at once suggest to the thoughtful reader, the means by which it is to be cultivated; and this has been our chief object in stating it.—But in whatever light we regard the *conscience,* one thing is indisputable, that its dictates are not uniformly the same in any one individual; and that they are exceedingly variable in different individuals, even with respect to the grand principles of duty, and still more with respect to the application of those principles. It is indisputable, that the moral principle grows to maturity from a small seed. It is indisputable, that it is susceptible of culture; that, if

neglected, its judgments become wavering and impotent; that if its dictates be made to undergo revision, if corrected by the means of knowledge we possess, and their defects supplied by the more extended views of duty, its decisions proportionally become more firm, and in general more efficacious. (See Paley, B. I. ch. 5.)

"Even an ardent desire to keep with exactness the best rules of duty, will not render attention unnecessary to the cultivation of the conscience; ('*I verily thought with myself*,' said the Apostle Paul, 'that *I ought* to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth;') and an enlightened love of duty must therefore urge to such cultivation. Dr. Cogan, in his Philosophical Treatise on the Passions, (p.348) adduces as an example of 'the influence of perverted principles,' 'the conduct of a pious Mother towards a most excellent and dutiful Son, who, from a principle of conscience, in opposition to his interests, renounced the religious system in which he had been educated, for another which he deemed more consonant to truth. She told him, that 'she found it her duty, however severe the struggle, to alienate her affections from him, now he had rendered himself an enemy to God by embracing such erroneous sentiments.' My friend added, that she was completely successful in these pious endeavours; and that the duty which she enjoined upon herself, was scrupulously performed during the remainder of her days.'—The same philosophic writer mentions another instance of the irregularity of the moral principle, in a child, in whose character mildness and compassion were pre-eminent features. 'I was once passing through Moorfields,' he says, 'with a young lady, aged about nine or ten years, born and educated in Portugal, but in the Protestant faith; and observing a large concourse of people assembled around a pile of faggots on fire, I expressed a curiosity to know the cause. She very composedly answered, 'I suppose it is nothing more than that they are going to burn a Jew.'

"From an attentive consideration to the nature of man, as well as from the declarations of revelation, it is clear that the conscience was intended, by the great Author of our frame, to be our guide in all cases of emergency, and to have great influence in every department of duty. It may often be most justly said, that the voice of conscience is the voice of God. Nevertheless, without due care and culture, it may be, and often is, erroneous and defective; and therefore it is not safe as an *exclusive* guide of duty, but should itself be put under the control of a still higher principle, the will of God. It is alike our wisdom and our duty, to enlighten, regulate, refine, and extend the dictates of the conscience, by the law of God, and other intimations of his will, and then submit implicitly to its direction."—(*Systematic Education: or Elementary Instruction, by the Rev. W. Shepherd, the Rev. J. Joyce, and the Rev. Lant Carpenter, LL. D.* vol. ii. p. 322.)

THE END.

PRINTED BY RICHARD AND ARTHUR TAYLOR, SHOE LANE, LONDON.

INDEX of Texts of Scripture cited in this Work.

		Page
Deut.	vi. 4	5, 6, 9
2 *Chron.*	vi. 13, 14, 18	93, 94
Job,	xxxii. 8	Pref. x
Psal.	xl. 7	36
Isai.	vi. 3	34
	ix. 5	39
	lxvi. 2	53
Dan.	iii. 25	35
Mic.	v. 2	38
Matt.	i. 18	39
	vii. 1	title page
	xi. 5	35
	27	42
	xiii. 29, 30	99
	xvi. 16, 17	36
	xviii. 20	13
	xxiii. 8, 9	82
	xxiv. 36	59
	xxvi. 39	29
	42	35
	xxvii. 46	29
	xxviii. 17	58
	20	13
Mark,	xii. 29	5, 6, 9
	xiii. 32	59
	xv. 34	29
Luke,	i. 30—35	40
	ii. 1, 2	25
	14	83
	46	35
	iii. 23	22
	x. 22	42
	xii. 57	title page
	xx. 36—38	16
	xxiv. 53	59
John,	i. 1, 3	38
	14	41
	50	19
	iii. 13	36
	34	41
	v. 4	14
	19	53, 35
	22, 23	56
	30	35
	viii. 58	38
	x. 36	30
	xii. 41	34
	xiv. 6	42
	9	36
	xv. 5	45
	xvii. 5	38, 16
	12, 22	16
	24	17
Acts,	ii. 36	107
	vii. 35	34
	56	58
	59	57
	x. 38	35, 41
	xv. 23	100
Rom.	i. 1—4	19
	iii. 2	47
	iv. 17	16
	v. 15	40
	viii. 29	16, 19
	30	16
	ix. 5	38
	xiv. 1, 2, 22	Pref. ix
	xvi. 20, 24	60
1 *Cor.*	iv. 3, 4	title page
	v. 3, 4	13
	xv. 20, 21	40
	24, 27, 28	59
	xvi. 23	60
	24	59
2 *Cor.*	v. 15	107
	xii. 7—9	63
Eph.	i. 3	106
	iii. 9	38
Phil.	ii. 6	18, 52
	7	18
	8	pref. xii. 18, 35
	9 11	pref. xii
	iv. 19, 20	60
	23	—
Col.	i. 15	39, 42
	16	38, 42, 67
	19	41
	ii. 3, 9	—
1 *Thess.*	iii 11	62
	v. 28	60
2 *Thess.*	iii. 18	61
1 *Tim.*	ii. 3, 4	pref. ix
	5	xii. 42, 53
2 *Tim.*	i. 10	ix
Heb.	i. 1	56, 67
	2	38, 56
	3	39, 56
	4—9	57
	ii. 14, 16	40
	17	pref. xii, 40
	iv. 15	40
	viii. 6	47
	x. 5	36
1 *Pet.*	iv. 11	84
1 *John,*	v. 20	31, 39
Rev.	v. 11—13	62
	xix. 13	39

INDEX.

ADDRESS of the Respondents, *page* 1—68
Appellant, Reply of the, 68—88
Alexander, Dykes, 100
———, Samuel, 102
———, Henry, 103
Allen, William, 1, 81
Apostolic Addresses and Benedictions strictly Unitarian, 59—62
Apology of Barclay quoted, 43, 45
Appellant, why disowned, 9
———, no Rule applicable to the Case of, 103
Appellant's Letter to Luke Howard, preface, iv.
Atkins, Joseph, 90
Ball, Richard, 86, 87, 101
Barclay, Quotations from, by the Respondents, 26, 37—45
———, Quotations from, by the Appellant, 12, 37, 41—45
———, whether an Arian or a Sabellian, 45
Belsham's Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ, 27, 28
Bevan, Joseph Gurney, 4, 49, 68, 81
Biddle, John, 48
Book of Extracts quoted, 3, 69, 100, 101
Braithwaite, Isaac, 102
Cadbury, Richard, 98
Candler, William, 92
Catchpool, Thomas, 99
Christian Observer, 70
Christ, the Greek name for Messiah, both signify the Anointed of God, 72
Church, the Established, concurs in consigning Legatt to the Flames in Smithfield, 37
Claridge, Quotation from, 64
———, his Essay on the Doctrine of the Trinity, 65
———, his learned Defence of Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken, 80
Clarke, Dr. Samuel, his Opinions of Sabellianism, 33
——, Thomas, 93
Committee of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting, their Confession to the Respondents, 10
Comparison by Penington between Antient and [supposed] Modern Revelation, 33, 34
Council, the first Christian, of whom composed, 100
Creed, Scriptural, the only proper one for Christians, 66
Crewdson, William Dilworth, 103
Davides, Francis, imprisoned for objecting to the Invocation of Christ, 87
Discipline of the Society, how usually applied, 2. Originally tolerant on points of Faith and Worship, 81
Discussion in the Yearly Meeting, leading features of, pref. vi. vii.
Disownment, to whom intrusted by the Rules of the Yearly Meeting, pref. vii.
Distinction between Unitarianism and Trinitarianism explained, 76
Divine Influence on the Human Mind, Doctrine of, 10
Divinity of that Power which dwelt in Christ Jesus asserted, 66, 67
Ellwood, Thomas, points out the contradictory Evidence of Geo. Keith respecting Wm. Penn, 15, 16
Evesham Hymn-book 30
"Eternal Son of God," an improper and unscriptural name of "the man Christ Jesus," 41—43
Evidence, Historical, how estimated by the Respondents, 26, 27
———, Scriptural, how estimated by many Quakers, 100, 101
Firmin, Thomas, 48
Forster, Josiah, his Address to the Yearly Meeting as a Respondent, 1—68
Fox, George, objects to the term Trinity as a new and unscriptural name of God, 31. Denied that "the true Christian's God" could be crucified, 32
Geldart, Joseph, his Speech in the Yearly Meeting, 94—98
Grellet, Stephen, 99
Grundy's Evangelical Christianity, 28
Gundry, William, 102
Gurney, Joseph, 91
Howard, Luke, Letter to, pref. v.
———, his Speeches in the Yearly Meeting, 20, 68, 71
Hymn used in the Church at Evesham,

asserting the Death of the Infinite Creator, 30
Hymn of Dr. Isaac Watts's, 97
Jesus Christ a true and real Man, 40
Imprimatur Rule nearly obsolete, pref. x.
Improved Version of the New Testament, Respondents' Quotations from, 12—17, 19—26
Incarnation of Christ, how said to be best assured to the Mind, 27
Inspiration, delusive Notions of, equally opposed to Reason and Revelation, 5, 100, 101
Keith, George, his Evidence concerning William Penn contradictory, and therefore unworthy of credit, 16
———, from being a zealous Quaker, becomes a professed Trinitarian, 54
Language, metaphorical, often improperly used, 101
Lean, Joel, 26
Legatt, Bartholomew, burnt in Smithfield for being a mere Scripturian, 37
Locke's Essay on Enthusiasm quoted concerning the Love of Truth, 63; of Reason and Revelation, 69
——— Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures quoted, 72, 73
Lloyd, Samuel, 91
London Unitarian Book Society, 6; objects of, stated by the Respondents, 7, 10, 11, 12
Mackellow, John, 89
Martin, William, 86
Meetings for Discipline, the supposed authority of, 3, 69
Messiah, the—the Son of God—the Sent of the Father, synonymous terms, 73
Ministers and Elders, Meetings of, mere Committees of the Meetings for Discipline till 1784. 88, 89.
Monthly and Quarterly Meetings, minute concerning their supposed authority, 3
Monthly Repository of Theology, &c. 55, 64, 85
Murray, Lindley, his Compendium of Religious Faith, &c. pref. x.
——— ——— quotes the most corrupted Texts, as being warranted by Divine Revelation, pref. xi.
Narrative, Appellant's, 5, 7—10, 44, 50—52
New Testament, improved Version of, 11, 12. Extracts from, 13, 14, 16
Oracles of God, text concerning, how misapplied, 84, 85
Parker, Charles, 98
Penington, Respondents' quotations from, 33—36
——— Appellant's quotations from, 35—37
Penn, William, quotations from, by the Respondents, 17, 18, 47—50, 53
——— ———, Appellant's quotations from, 51—53, 66, 74, 75, 80
Portraiture of Primitive Quakerism by William Penn, 5; Remarks on, 6
Prichard, Thomas, 6
Purver's Translation of the Scriptures, published in 1764, 12
Quakers reject the Doctrine of a Distinction of Persons in the Deity, yet profess to believe the Divinity of Christ, 76
Ratcliff Monthly Meeting, Sketch of its reputed Orthodoxy and real Intolerance, 5
Reason the proper test of all supernatural Revelation, 69
Respondents' Reply, how described to Friends in the Country, pref. iii
——— how completely successful, iv
——— Address to the Yearly Meeting, 1—68
Revelation, natural Reason improved and instructed, 69
Sabellianism, Dr. Samuel Clarke, his opinion of, 33
Sabellians and Socinians compared to each other by Claridge, 64, 65
Saunders, George, 89, 99
Scott, Job, his estimate of the value of Appeal among Friends, 2
Scriptures, duty and advantage of reading publicly, pref. xii
——— Respondents' quotations from, 5, 6, 13, 14, 16—22, 29—31, 34—42, 44, 45, 52, 56—58, 60—63, 67, 71—75, 82, 83, 97, 100

Scriptures, Appellant's quotations from, 9, 11, 14, 26, 29, 30, 33, 35, 39, 43, 47, 53, 56—63, 67, 71—75, 82—84
Secrets in Religion, the Apostles had none, 60; Sectarians have, 98, 99
Sewel's History, Respondents' quotation from, 54, 55
Shipley, John, 102
Socinus, a persecutor, worshiped the man Christ Jesus, 40, 87
Steele, Sir R., his strange notion that the God of Nature died, 30
Stacey, George, 1, 81
Storrs, Joseph, 102
Tillotson, Archbishop, his opinion of the Athanasian Creed, 23
Tract Association among Friends, 71
Tregellis, Samuel, 103
Trinity, doctrine of, rejected by George Fox, 31
Tucket, J., jun., of Basingstoke, 84
Tuke, William, 79, 86—88, 89
Union, mysterious, of three Persons in the Deity no Scriptural Doctrine, pref. xi
Unitarian Book Society, 6, 9—12, 27, 28, 46, 70, 71, 95
Verax's Christian Unitarianism vindicated, 50, 64, 65
Version, Received, contains corrupted and perverted Passages, 37
Westlake, William, 102
Whitehead, George, opposed the Doctrine of the Trinity, 48
Whom ought we alone to worship? pref. viii
Wilkinson, John, his Speeches as Clerk to the Yearly Meeting, 71, 72, 86, 89, 93, 98, 102, 103
Worship in the Received Version sometimes means only civil respect or obeisance, 58
Wright, Isaac, 100, 102
Yearly Meeting Epistle, Rem. on, 9
——— ———, Minutes of, 3, 4, 6, 69, 84, 88, 100
——— ———, how Questions that come before them are settled, 104
——— ——— far from adopting any Trinitarian Hypothesis, 105—108

ERRATA.

Page 89, line 16, *for* I intreated, *read* I intreat.
101, line 3, *for* will be, *read* will I believe be.
105, line 3 of note, *for* not *real*, *read* not the *real*.